UC-NRLF
B 4 016 640

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Class 683
L352
cop. 2

X478

OPUSCULA.

ESSAYS

CHIEFLY

PHILOLOGICAL AND ETHNOGRAPHICAL

BY

ROBERT GORDON LATHAM,

M.A., M.D., F.R.S., ETC.

LATE FELLOW OF KINGS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, LATE PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON, LATE ASSISTANT PHYSICIAN AT THE MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL.

WILLIAMS & NORGATE,

14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON

AND

20 SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

LEIPZIG, R. HARTMANN.

1860.

GENERAL

LEIPZIG PRINTED BY B. G. TEUBNER.

P27
L23
1860
MAIN

PREFACE.

The essays in the present volume are chiefly upon philological and ethnographical subjects: though not exclusively. The earliest was published in 1840, the latest in 1856. In some cases they have formed separate treatises and in some Appendices to larger works. The greater part, however, consists of papers read before the Philological Society of London; a society which has materially promoted the growth of Comparative Philology in Great Britain, and which, if it had merely given to the world the valuable researches of the late Mr. Garnett, would have done more than enough to justify its existence and to prove its usefulness.

As a general rule these papers address themselves to some definite and special question, which commanded the attention of the author either because it was obscure, or because there was something in the current opinions concerning it which, in his eyes, required correction. Researches conducted on this principle can scarcely be invested with any very general interest. Those who take them up are supposed to have their general knowledge beforehand. A wide field and a clear view, they have already taken. At the same time there are, in the distant horizon, imperfect outlines, and in the parts nearer to the eye dim spots where the light is uncertain, dark spots where it is wholly wanting, and, oftener still, spots illumined by a false and artificial light. Some of the details of the following investigations may be uninteresting from their minuteness; some from their obscurity; the minuteness however, and the obscurity which deprive them of general interest make it all the more incumbent on some one to take them up: and it is needless to add that for a full and complete system of ethnographical or philological knowledge all the details that are discoverable should be discovered. This is my excuse (if excuse be needed) for having spent some valuable time upon obscure points of minute interest. Upon the whole, they have not been superfluous. This means that I have

101620

rarely, or never, found from any subsequent reading that they had been anticipated. Where this has been the case, the article has been omitted — being treated as a *non scriptum*. An elaborate train of reasoning submitted to the Ethnographical Society has on this principle been ignored. It was upon the line of migration by which the Polynesian portion of the Pacific islands was peopled. It deduced Polynesia from the Navigator's Islands; the Navigator's Islands, or Samoan Archipelago, from the Ralik and Radak chains; the Ralik and Radak chains from Micronesia; Micronesia from the Philippines, viâ Sonsoral and the Pelews. Some time after the paper was read I found that Forster has promulgated the same doctrine. I ought to have known it before. Hence the paper is omitted: indeed it was (though read) never published.

In respect to the others the chief writers who have worked in the same field are Dr. Scouler, Professor Turner, and Professor Buschmann, — not to mention the bibliographical labours of Dr. Ludwig, and the second paper of Gallatin. I have no hesitation in expressing my belief that where they agree with me they do so as independent investigators; claiming for myself, where I agree with them, the same consideration.

Of Hodgson and Logan, Windsor Earle, and other investigators I should have much to say in the way of both aknowledgement and criticism, had India and the Indian Archipelago taken as large a portion of the present volume as is taken by North America. As it is, it is only in a few points that I touch their domain.

The hypothesis that the Asteks (so-called) reached Mexico by sea I retract. Again — the fundamental affinity of the Australian language was a doctrine to which both Teichelmann and Sir G. Grey had committed themselves when the paper on the Negrito languages was written. The papers, however, stand as they stood: partly because they are worth something in the way of independent evidence, and partly because they illustrate allied subjects.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

I.

PÆDEUTICA.

INAUGURAL LECTURE

DELIVERED AT

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON,

OCTOBER 14, 1839.

Instead of detaining you with a dissertation upon the claims and the merits of our Language, it may perhaps be better to plunge at once into the middle of my subject, and to lay before you, as succinctly as I am able, the plan and substance of such Lectures as, within these walls, I promise myself the honour of delivering. For I consider that the vast importance of thoroughly understanding, of comprehending, in its whole length, and breadth, and height, and depth, the language which we all speak, we all read, and we all (in different degrees, but still each in our degree) have occasion to write — the importance also of justly and upon true grounds, valuing the magnificent literature of which we are the inheritors — I consider, I say, that the vast importance of all this is sufficiently implied by the simple single fact, that, in this Institution, the English Language, with the English Literature, is recognized as part and parcel of a liberal education. It may also be assumed, without further preface, that every educated man is, at once, ambitious of writing his own Language well; of criticizing those who write it badly; and of taking up his admiration of our National Literature, not upon Trust but upon Knowledge.

Thus having premised, I now proceed to the divisions and the subdivisions of my subject. For certain practical purposes it is found expedient to draw, between the consideration of the English Language, and the consideration of

the English Literature, a broad line of demarcation. The knowledge of books is one thing; the knowledge of the rules of good composition is another thing. It is one thing to know what other men have written; it is another thing to know how you should yourself write. The one is a point of Literary History, or of Literary Biography; the other is a point of Rhetoric, or a point of Grammar. I do not say that the two studies do not mutually assist each other. All studies do so: these in a great degree. Familiarity with the works of a Shakspeare or a Milton, is an accomplishment — an accomplishment that depends upon our taste, and one which depends also upon our leisure — an accomplishment which cannot be too highly valued, but still an accomplishment. Familiarity, however, with the rules of good writing is not a mere accomplishment. It is a necessary qualification which comes home to us all. Now if I am convinced of one thing more than of another, I am convinced of the truth of this assertion; *viz.:* that a good style comes not of itself; it comes not uncalled for; and it comes neither by instinct nor by accident. It is the result of art, and the result of practise. The Rules of good Composition are the rules of Rhetoric; and it is very necessary that they be neither neglected nor undervalued. Two classes of men, and two classes only, can pretend to dispense with them — those that can write well, and those that cannot write at all.

The English Language is pre-eminently a mixed Language. Its basis indeed is Saxon, but upon this basis lies a very varied superstructure, of Danish and of Norman-French, of Modern French and of Greek, of Classical Latin and of the Latin of the Middle Ages imported at different periods and upon different occasions. Words from these languages are comprehended by the writer just in the proportion that he comprehends their origin and their derivation. Hence it is that the knowledge of isolated words is subordinate to the formation of a style; and hence it is that the rules for their investigation are (their aim and object being alone considered) akin to the rules of Rhetoric.

This however is but a small part of what may be our studies. It is well to know how Time affects Languages, and in what way it modifies them. It is well to know how one dialect grows out of another, and how its older stages differ from its newer ones. It is well if we can perceive that these variations are in no wise arbitrary; but it is better still if we can discover the laws that regulate them. Yet all this is but a knowledge of the changes that words undergo, a knowledge of the changes in their form, and a

knowledge of the changes in their meaning. Now these points are points of Etymology, the word being used in its very laxest and its largest sense; and points of Etymology must, in no wise, be neglected or undervalued.

Lectures upon these questions will form the Etymological part of a course; and Lectures upon Prose Composition the Rhetorical part of one; whilst the two, taken together, will give a course upon the English Language, in contradistinction to one upon the English Literature.

In respect to the latter, I shall, at regular intervals, fix upon some new period, or some new subject, and, to the best of my power, illustrate it.

Thus much for the divisions and subdivisions of the subject-matter.

The considerations that come next in order are the considerations of the manner of exhibiting it, the considerations of the knowledge that can be detailed, and the considerations of the trains of thought that can be inculcated.

There are those who believe that a good style is not to be taught. Many think that the habit of writing good Prose, is like the power of creating good Poetry; a privilege that we are born to, and not a possession that we can earn; and a wit once said that, in order to write clearly, it was only necessary to understand what you would write about. If this be true, then is composition an easy matter indeed; or, to say the very least, a perspicuous style is as common as a clear understanding. The experience of the world has, however, set aside the decision of the wit, and the practice of inexperienced writers has belied his dogma. To write well you must understand not only the *matter* but the *medium*. Thus then it is, that, with respect to the use of books, and with respect to the use of rules, in our attempts at the formation of a good style, some persons neglect them as unavailing, and some despise them as superfluous.

Towards accurate writing Habit of some sort is indispensably essential. Yet this indispensable habit is not necessarily a habit of *writing*. A person who writes no more frequently than the common occasions of life demand, shall eventually, provided that he will habitually write his best, write accurately. Now the habit of criticism, and the habit of attention essential to habits of writing our best, a second person is, I think, able to inculcate. Such a second person should be familiar with bad as well as with good writing; even, as the physician shall grow conversant, not with health only, but with disease also. He should know what are the more egregious errors in composition; he should

know also what are the more usual ones. He should be learned in the inaccuracies of good authors, and deeply erudite in the absurdities of bad ones; recognizing false taste under all its disguises, and holding up, as a beacon to avoid, the pitiful ambition of mannerism and of writing finely. The principles by which he tries these things, he can lay before his hearers; and he can illustrate them with a prodigality of commentary. And those who hearken shall thus grow critical. And, mark — the reader that continually and habitually criticizes others, soon comes to, continually and habitually, criticize himself. He grows fastidious, as it were, perforce.

In this way two things may be done: our criticism may be sharpened, and its edge may be turned upon ourselves. At this I aim, and not at teaching Rhetoric systematically.

The father of Horace, as we learn from the testimony of his son, was peculiar in his notions of education. In his eyes it was easier to eschew Vice than to imitate Virtue. Too wise a man not to know that an unapproachable model was no model at all, he let (for instance) the modesty of Virgil (as modest virtues generally contrive to do) speak for itself. But he counselled his son against the prodigality of Barrus, and held up, with parental prudence, the detected peccadilloes of Trebonius.

Now the system, that produces a negative excellence in morals, may produce also a negative excellence in literature. More than this (for the truth must be told) Art can not do. For Wit, and Vigour, and Imagination we must be indebted to Nature.

I know that the system of picking out, and holding up, either a neighbour's foibles, or an author's inelegancies, is not a gracious occupation; the question, however, is, not whether it be gracious or ungracious but whether it be efficient or inefficient.

Whosoever is conversant with the writings of etymologists must be well aware, that there are few subjects wherein men run wild to the degree that they run wild in *Etymology*. A little learning, dangerous everywhere, is preeminently dangerous in Etymology. There has been in the world an excess of bad etymology for two reasons.

The discovery of remote analogies is not only mental exercise, but, worse luck, it is a mental amusement as well. The imagination is gratified, and Criticism thinks it harsh to interpose.

Again, there is no language that a man so willingly illustrates as he illustrates his own. He knows it best, and he

studies it with the greatest ease. He loves it not wisely but too well. He finds in its structure new and peculiar beauties; he overvalues its excellence, and he exaggerates its antiquity. Such are the men who talk — in Wales, of the ubiquity of the Celts; in Germany, of the Teutonic Origin of the Romans; and in Ireland of the Phœnician extraction of the Milesians.

Thus then, two out of the Thousand and One causes of bad Etymology are the reason psychological, and the reason patriotic. *Nemini credendum de Patria sua.*

I think that at the entrance upon an unsettled subject, a man should boldly say, and say at the very onset of his career, upon whose opinions he relies, and whose opinions he distrusts. He should profess himself, not indeed the implicit follower of any School, but he should name the School that he preferred. He should declare whose books he could recommend, and whose he would eschew. Thus, if I were lecturing upon Geology, I should say, at once, whether I were what is called a Scriptural Geologist or a Latitudinarian one: And thus, in the department in point, I name the writers I put faith in. In the works of Grimm and Rask I place much trust; in those of Horne Tooke some; and in those of Whiter and Vallancey (to name small men along with great) none whatsoever.

In the study of the Languages that have ceased to be spoken we find, in an Etymological view, one thing, and one thing only; words as they *have* been affected by previous processes of change; in other terms, the *results* of these processes. But in the Language that we hear spoken around us, and, still more, in the Language that we ourselves speak, we find something more than *results;* we find the *processes* that give occasion to them; in other terms, we see the change *as it takes place.* Within the lifetime of an individual, within even a very few years, those that look may find, not only that certain words are modified in respect to their meaning, and certain letters modified, in respect to their pronunciation, but they may also see *how* these modifications are brought about, ascertaining — of words the intermediate meanings, and of letters the intermediate sounds. We may trace the gradations throughout. We can, of our own Language, and in our own Times, see, with a certainty, what change our Language more especially affects; we can observe its tendencies. And we can do this because we can find towards what particular laxities (be they of meaning or be they of pronunciation) ourselves and our neighbours more especially have a bias. We can, as it were, *prophesy.* We

cannot do this with the Latin of Augustus; we cannot do it with the Greek of Pericles.

Hence it is that what we will know, to a certainty, of Etymological processes, must be collected from Cotemporary Languages. Those who look for them elsewhere seek for the Living among the Dead; arguing from things unknown (at least unknown to a certainty), and so speculating laxly, and dogmatizing unphilosophically. Hence it is, that in Cotemporary Languages, and of those Cotemporary Languages, in our own most especially, we may lay deep and strong, and as the only true substratum of accurate criticism, the foundations of our knowledge of Etymological Processes. And, observe, we can find them in a sufficient abundance provided that we sufficiently look out for them. For Processes, the same in kind, though not the same in degree, are found in all languages alike. No process is found in any one language that is not also found (in some degree or other) in our own; and no process can be found in our own language which does not (in some degree or other) exist in all others beside. There are no such things as Peculiar Processes: since Languages differ from each other, not in the nature of their Processes, but in the degrees of their development. These are bold, perhaps novel, assertions, but they are not hasty ones. (1)

Simply considered as an *Instrument* of Etymology I imagine that the study of Cotemporary Languages is, in its importance, of the very first degree; while next in value to this (considered also, as an *Instrument* of Etymology,) is the study of Languages during what may be called their breakings-up, or their transitions.

There are two stages in Language. Through these two stages all Languages, sooner or later, make their way; some sooner than others, but all sooner or later. Of this the Latin language may serve as an illustration. In the time of Augustus it expressed the relations of Time and Place, in other words, its Cases and Tenses, by Declension and Conjugation, or, broadly speaking, by Inflexion. In the time of Dante there was little or no Inflexion, but there was an abundance of Auxiliary Verbs, and an abundance of Prepositions in its stead. The expression of Time and Place by independent words superseded the expression by Inflections. Now in all Languages the inflectional stage comes first. This is a Law. There are Languages that stay for ever (at least for an indefinite time) in their earlier stage. Others there are again, that we never come in contact with before they have proceeded to their later one. Languages

of this latter kind are of subordinate value to the Etymologist. Those that he values most are such as he sees in the two stages: so being enabled to watch the breaking-up of one, the constitution of the other, and the transition intermediate to the two.

Now our own language (the Anglo Saxon being borne in mind) comes under the conditions that constitute a good and sufficient language as a disciplinal foundation in Etymology. *It can be studied in two stages.* When we come to the Times of the Conquest we must gird up our loins for the acquisition of a new Language.

The Breaking-up of the Latin (I speak for the sake of illustration and comparison) is a study in itself. It is a study complete and sufficient; not, however, more so than is the study of the Breaking-up of the Gothic. For in this stock of Tongues, not only did the Saxon pass into the English, but the Mœso-Gothic, the Scandinavian, and the Frisian, each gave origin to some new Tongue; the first to the High German, the second to the Languages of Scandinavia, and the third to the Modern Dutch. The study then of the Languages of the Gothic stock is something more than a sufficient disciplinal foundation in Etymology. (2)

In matters of pronunciation, living Languages have an exclusive advantage. For dead Languages speak but to the eye; and it is not through the eye that the ear is to be instructed.

It is well for the Geologist to classify rocks, and to arrange strata, to distinguish minerals, and to determine fossils; but it is far better if, anterior to this, he will study the Powers of Nature, and the Processes that are their operations: and these he can only study as he sees them in the times wherein he lives, or as he finds them recorded in authentic and undisputed histories. With this knowledge he can criticize, and construct; without it he may invent and imagine. Novel and ingenious he may, perchance, become; but he can never be philosophical, and he can never be Scientific. So it is with the Etymologist. Whenever, in a dead Language, he presumes a Process, which he has looked for in vain in a living one, he outruns his data. The basis of Etymology is the study of existing Processes.

Our Language has had its share; I must hasten to the consideration of our Literature.

The Early Literature of most modern Nations consists of the same elements; of Legends concerning their Saints, of Chronicles, and of Hymns and Romances. Too much of this fell into the hands of the Monks; and these were, too

often, the prosaic writers of barbarous Latinity; for Prose (if not in language at least in idea) was, with them, the rule; and Poetry the exception. Such is the general character of the Early Modern Literature; in which, however, our Saxon ancestors were, somewhat (indeed much) more fortunate than their neighbours. Monkish writing was with them an important element; but it was not the only one. They had an originality besides. And the Scandinavians were more fortunate still. The worshippers of Odin and Thor had a *Mythology;* and Mythologies are the Creators and Creations of Poetry. The Norse Mythology is as poetical as the Grecian. I speak this advisedly. Now this Mythology was common to all the Gothic Tribes. The Saxon and the Norse Literatures dealt (each in their degree) with the same materials; they breathed the same spirit; and they clothed it in an allied Language. But the Saxon Mythology is fragmentary; while the Norse Mythology is a whole. For this reason Scandinavian (or Norse) Literature is not extraneous to my subject.

These, the primeval and Pagan times of our ancestors, must claim and arrest our attention; since it is from these that our characteristic modes of Thought (call them Gothic, or call them Romantic) are derived. In the regions of Paganism lie the dark fountains of our Nationality.

Beside this, I consider that, even in the matter of Language, the direct Scandinavian element of the English is much underrated; (3) and still more underrated is the indirect Scandinavian element of the Norman-French. And here, again, when we come to the Conquest, we must grapple with new dialects, irregular imaginations, and mystical and mysterious Mythologies; for the things that have a value in Language, have a value in History also.

Now come, in due order, and in lineal succession, the formation of our Early English Literature, and the days of Chaucer; and then those of Spenser: periods necessary to be illustrated, but which may be illustrated at a future time. And after these the Æra of Elizabeth, fertile in great men, and fertile in great poets; so much so, that (the full view being too extensive) it must be contemplated by instalments and in sections.

There are many reasons for choosing as a subject for illustration the Dramatic Poets of this Period. They stood as great men amid a race of great men; so doing, they have a claim on our attention on the simple solitary grounds of their own supereminent excellence. But, besides this, they are, with the exception of their one great representative,

known but imperfectly. Too many of us consider the Age of Elizabeth as the Age of Shakspeare exclusively. Too many of us have been misled by the one-sided partiality of the Shakspearian commentators. These men, in the monomania of their idolatry, not only elevate their author into a Giant, but dwarve down his cotemporaries into pigmies. And who knows not how (on the moral side of the question) their writings are filled even to nauseousness, with the imputed malignity of Ben Jonson? Themselves being most malignant.

This, however, has been, by the labor of a late editor, either wholly done away with, or considerably diluted. Be it with us a duty, and be it with us a labour of love, to seek those commentators who have rescued great men from the neglect of Posterity; and be our sympathies with the diligent antiquarian, who shows that obloquy has originated unjustly; and be our approbation with those who have corrected the errors of Fame, loosely adopted, and but lately laid aside.

Yet here we must guard against a reaction. Malone, and his compeers, valued, or seemed to value, the Elizabethan Drama, just for the light that it threw upon the text of their idol. Gifford, goaded into scorn by injustice, fought the fight on the other side, with strength and with spirit: but he fought it like a partizan; reserving (too much, but as Editors are wont to do,) his admiration and his eulogy for those whom he himself edited. Next came Hazlitt and Charles Lamb; who found undiscovered beauties in poets still more neglected. I think, however, that they discovered these beauties, or at any rate that they exaggerated them, in a great degree on account of their being neglected.

Be there here a more Catholic criticism! be there here eulogies more discriminate! be there here tastes less exclusive!

The Elizabethan Drama is, pre-eminently independent, it is pre-eminently characteristic, it is also pre-eminently English. It is deeply, very deeply, imbued, with the colours and complexion of the age that gave it origin. It has much Wisdom, and much Imagination. The last of our Early Dramatists is Shirley. With him terminates the School of Shakspeare. The transition hence is sudden and abrupt. Imagination decays; Wit predominates. Amatory poets write as though they wore their hearts in their heads. Wit is perfected. It had grown out of a degeneracy of Imagination; it will soon be sobered into Sense; Sense the predominant characteristic of the writers under Queen Anne. The school of Dryden passes into that of Pope, Prior being, as it were, intermediate. The Æra of the Charleses comprises two Schools; the School of Cowley, falsely called Metaphysical, with an ex-

cess of Fancy, and a deficiency of Taste, and the School of Dryden, whose masculine and fiery intellectuality simulates, aye! and *is*, genius. Tragedy has run retrograde; but Comedy is evolving itself towards a separate existence, and towards its full perfection. The Spirit of Milton stands apart from his cotemporaries; reflecting nothing of its age but its self-relying energy, moral and intellectual.

Now, although, the Schools of Cowley and the Schools of Dryden, differ essentially from that particular section of the Elizabethan Æra, which we have just contemplated, they do not differ, essentially, from another section of that same æra. Be this borne in mind. There are in Literature, no precipitate transitions. The greatest men, the most original thinkers, the most creative spirits stand less alone than the world is inclined to imagine. Styles of composition, that in one generation are rife and common, always exist in the age that went before. They were not indeed its leading characteristics, but still they were existent within it. The metrical Metaphysics of Cowley were the metrical metaphysics of Donne: the versified Dialectics of Dryden may be found, with equal condensation but less harmony, in the Elizabethan writings of Sir John Davies. The section of one age is the characteristic of the next. This line of criticism is a fair reason (one out of many) for never overlooking and never underrating obscure composers and obsolete literature.

The School of Pope, and the School of our own days, are too far in the prospective to claim any immediate attention.

And here I feel myself obliged to take leave of a subject, that continually tempts me to grow excursive.

There are two sorts of lecturers; those that absolutely teach, and those that stimulate to learn; those that exhaust their subject, and those that indicate its bearings; those that infuse into their hearers their own ideas, and those that set them a-thinking for themselves. For my own part, it is, I confess, my aim and ambition to succeed in the latter rather than in the former object. To carry such as hear me through a series of Authors, or through a course of Languages, in full detail, is evidently, even if it were desirable, an impossibility; but it is no impossibility to direct their attention to the prominent features of a particular subject, and to instil into them the imperious necessity of putting forth their own natural powers in an independent manner, so as to read for themselves, and to judge for themselves. Now as I would rather see a man's mind active than capacious; and, as I love Self-reliance better than Learning, I have no more

sanguine expectation, than, that instead of exhausting my subject I may move you to exhaust it for yourselves, may sharpen criticism, may indicate original sources, and, above all, suggest trains of honest, earnest, patient and persevering reflection.

NOTES.

NOTE 1, p. 6. l. 24.

To be heard with confidence we must prove that we have anticipated objections. There are those who shew reason for believing that the inflectional elements were once independent roots: in other words (or rather in a formal expression) that a given case = the root + a preposition, and that a given tense = the root + the substantive verb. Now believing that, although two forms may be thus accounted for, the third may have a very different origin, in other words, drawing a difference between *a* method of accounting for a given part of speech, and *the* method of so doing, I find that the bearings of the objection are as follows: —

The independent words, anterior to their amalgamation with the root, and anterior to their power as elements in inflection were either, like the present prepositions and the verb substantive, exponents of the relations of Time and Place, or they were, like the present nouns and verbs, names expressive of ideas: and presuming the former to have been the case, the old inflected Languages may have grown out of Languages like our own; and, *vice versa*, Languages uninflected (or at least comparatively so), like our own, may give rise to inflected ones like the Latin: in which case, a Cycle is established, and the assertion concerning the sequence falls to the ground.

Now the assertion concerning the *two* stages professes to be true only as far as it goes. The fact that certain nations are even now evolving a rudimentary inflection out of a vocabulary of independent roots, gives us, as an etymological phenomenon, a *third*, and an earlier stage of Language; a stage, however, of which cognizance, out of a work on Etymology, would have been superfluous. The independent roots, however, in these Languages coincide, not with the prepositions and the verbs substantive of (comparatively) uninflected Languages, but with their Nouns and Verbs.

To an objector of another sort who should inquire (for instance) where was the Passive Voice in English, or the Definite Article in Latin, the answer would be that the question shewed a misapprehension of the statement in the text, which is virtually this: not that there is either in English or Latin, respectively, Passive Voices, or Definite Articles, but that there are in the two Languages the processes that evolve them. It may also be added, that (an apparent truism) the quantity of Processes depends upon the *capacity* of the Language. A dialect consisting (as some do) of about ten-score words can *bear* but a proportionate number of Processes. The truth, however, of the state-

ments in question depends upon this: viz. that all the processes there existing are the processes that exist elsewhere, and that all processes which, with a given increase of Language may at any future time be developed, shall coincide, in kind, with the processes of other Languages.

It may be satisfactory to the Author of the Principles of Geology to discover that his criticism affects other sciences besides his own. Notwithstanding the industry, and acumen of continental critics, it may be doubted whether the Principles of Etymology (as a *Science)* have not yet to be exhibited. I use the word *exhibited* intentionally. That many Etymologists *apply* them I am most certain; where, however, do we find them detailed in system, or recognised as tests?

We draw too much upon the Philologists of Germany; and where men draw indefinitely they trust implicitly. I believe that the foundations of Etymology are to be laid upon the study of existing processes; and I grow sanguine when I remember that by no one so well as by an Englishman can these processes be collected. With the exception of the Russian (a doubtful exception) we come in contact with more Languages than any nation under the Sun. Here then we have an advantage in externals. The details of Etymology I can willingly give up to the scholars of the Continent; in these they have already reaped a harvest: but for the *Principles* of Etymology, I own to the hope that it may be the English School that shall be the first to be referred to and the last to be distrusted. In sketching the outline of a system of Scientific Etymology, I again borrow my analogies from Geology. Its primary divisions would be two: 1stly, The processes that change the *form* of words, or the *formal* processes. 2ndly, The processes that change their *meanings*, or the *Logical* processes. The first of these would be based upon the affinities and interchanges of *sounds*, the second upon the affinities and interchanges of *ideas:* the sciences (amongst others) which they were erected on being, respectively, those of Acoustics and Metaphysics; and the degrees of Etymological probability would then coincide with the correspondence of the two sorts of processes.

Few Etymologists have any conception of the enormous influence of small and common processes, provided that the extent of Language that they affect be considerable. In the very generalizing classification of Languages into Monosyllabic, Triliteral, and Polysynthetic, I put no trust; for I can refer (to my own satisfaction at least) the differences that are generally attributed to an original diversity of composition, to a diversity in the development of processes: in other words, I know of processes which with a given degree of development render the three classes convertible each in the other. With these notions I, of course, take exceptions to the *Principle* of the classification; for I deny that the *Form* of a Language is, in any degree, an essential characteristic. The axiom is not *Propter formam Lingua est id quod est*, but *Propter elementa Lingua est id quod est.* The question concerning the Classification in point is analogous to the question concerning the Chemical and the Natural-History Classification in Mineralogy.

Note 2, p. 7. l. 22.

Were it not for the admixture of other questions, the present Lecture might have been entitled *The Sufficiency of the English Language as a Disciplinal Study in Grammar and Etymology, irrespective of the fact of its being the native Language of Englishmen.* The appended qualification

is in no wise a superfluity. Our native Language is the best instrument in Disciplinal Study simply because it is our native one; and a Pole, a Spaniard, or Hungarian can best lay in their ideas of General Grammar from the special study of the Polish, Spanish, and Hungarian Languages respectively. The very palpable reason for this is that, before we can advantageously study the System of a Language, we must have acquired a certain quantity of the detail of it. Now, in the attempt to collect ideas of General Grammar from the study of a Foreign Language, we shall find that the Theory will be swamped by the Practice; in other words, that, by attempting to do two things at once, we shall do one of them badly. Merely, then, to have predicated in England, of the English Language, that it was a good and sufficient Disciplinal Instrument would have been to have remained silent as to its *abstract* merits as such.

Of these abstract merits the degree depends upon the chronological extent of Language that we make use of. To get them at their *maximum* the Two Stages must be taken in: and the Two Stages being taken in, it is more on a par with the Languages of Classical Antiquity, than it has generally been considered to be. Still (considered thus far only) it is inferior to them. For the Greek and Latin, exceeding it in the quantity of original Inflection, have run through an equal quantity of change. Considering, however, not the English only, but the whole range of allied Languages forming the Gothic Stock, the question takes a different shape. As a Magazine of Processes and Principles, the Gothic Stock not only equals the Classical, but exceeds, by far, the Greek Branch of it. The Hebrew from its *quasi*-symbolic form has Disciplinal merits of its own.

Let the Languages of Greece and Italy be learned for their own sake; and by those who have the privilege to appreciate them. One might think that the works of Homer and Demosthenes, of Lucretius and Cæsar, were a sufficient reason for turning with diurnal and nocturnal hands the copies that exhibit them. But let us not (as we often are) be told that it is necessary to study the Latin or the Greek Accidence for the sake of learning grammar in general. The self-deception that in taking up Latin and Greek we are studying a Grammar, instead of beginning a Literature, is too often the excuse for concluding our studies just where they might advantageously begin, and for looking with complacency upon limited acquirements just where limited acquirements are pre-eminently of little use.

Note 3, p. 8, l. 27.

I feel that the assertion here made requires modifying and explaining. I should be sorry to be supposed to have made it, under the old notion that in any written records of the Saxon Literature there is any ostensible admixture of Danish (*i. e.* Scandinavian); still less do I participate in the belief of the early Gothic Scholars in the existence of their so-called Dano-Saxon Dialect. I recognize, moreover, the criticism that refers the apparent Danish (Scandinavian) element of the East-Anglian, and Northumbrian Glossaries to the original affinity between the extreme Low German and the extreme Scandinavian Dialects: thus making it *indirect*. It was once my opinion (one which I have since modified but not given up) that in the present English, and consequently in the Low Germanic Branch of the Gothic Stock, obscure traces of the great Scandinavian characteristics (*viz.* the existence of a Passive Middle or Reflective Voice, and the peculiar expression of the

sense of the Definite Article) could be discovered: but it was not upon this idea that I founded the assertion in the text.

The question has its peculiar difficulties. Words that have long passed for Scandinavian, are continually being detected in the Saxon; so that the Philologist who should say *this word is Scandinavian and not Saxon* has the difficult task of proving a negative. Again, the point is one upon which no single person's assertion should be received. Hastiness of Induction, in favour of particular Languages, when we know these Languages (as every Language, indeed as every kind of Knowledge, must be known) at the expense of some other, comes upon us unconsciously. The Languages of the Gothic Stock that I know best are those of Scandinavia; the Provincial Dialect of England which I have most studied is that of Lincolnshire, and the neighbouring maritime Counties. Here the preeminence of the Danish (Scandinavian) element being acknowledged, the question is whether it be *Direct* or *Indirect*. I am free to confess that this circumstance sharpens my sight for the perception (true or false) of direct Danish elements. As a counterbalance, however, the consciousness of it engenders a proportionate self-distrust.

Upon the whole, I would rather that the sentence had run thus: *the Direct Scandinavian element in the English is still to be determined, and here (as in many other places) there is open ground for the original investigator.*

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

INTRODUCTORY LECTURE,

DELIVERED

AT THE MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL,

OCTOBER 1, 1847.

There are certain facts of such paramount importance, that they not only bear, but require, repetition. The common duties of every-day life, and the common rules of social policy, are matters which no moralist states once for all: on the contrary, they are reiterated as often as occasion requires — and occasion requires them very often.

Now it is from the fact of certain medical duties, both on the part of those who teach and those who learn, being of this nature, that, with the great schools of this metropolis, every year brings along with it the necessity of an address similar to the one which I have, on this day, the honour of laying before you.

You that come here to learn, come under the pressure of a cogent responsibility — in some cases of a material, in others of a moral nature — in all, however, most urgent and most imperative.

To the public at large — to the vast mass of your fellow-creatures around you — to the multitudinous body of human beings that sink under illness, or suffer from pain — to the whole of that infinite family which has bodily, not unmixed with mental affliction, for its heritage upon earth — to all who live, and breathe, and feel, and share with yourselves the common lot of suffering — here, in their whole height and depth, and length and breadth, are your responsibilities of one kind. You promise the palliation of human ailment: but you break that high promise if you act unskilfully. You call to you all those that are oppressed; but you may aggravate the misery that you should comfort and relieve. You bear with you the outward and visible signs, if not of the high wisdom that heals, at least of the sagacious care that

alleviates. Less than this is a stone in the place of bread; and less than this is poison in the fountain-springs of hope.

Not at present, indeed, but within a few brief years it will be so. Short as is human life, the period for the learning of your profession is but a fraction of the time that must be spent in the practice of it. A little while, and you may teach where you now learn. Within a less period still, you will practise what you are now taught.

And practice must not be begun before you have the fitness that is sufficient for it. Guard against some of the current commonplaces of carelessness, and procrastination. Lawyers sometimes say "that no man knows his profession when he begins it." And what lawyers say of law, medical men repeat about physic. Men of that sort of standing in medicine which, like the respectability of an old error, is measured by time alone, are fondest of talking thus; and men of no standing of any sort are fondest of being their echoes. It is the current paradox of your practical men, *i. e.* of men who can be taught by practice alone. Clear your heads of this nonsense. It will make you egotists, and it will make you empirics: it will make you men of one idea: it will make you, even when you fancy it would do you just the contrary, the wildest of speculators. The practice of practical men, in the way I now use the words, is a capital plan for making anything in the world, save and except practitioners.

Well! this has seemed excursive, but it is not so: it is a reason against the putting off of your learning-time. When your first case comes, you must be as fit for it as you are ready for it.

A difference between old practitioners and beginners there always will be — so long at least as there is value in experience, and a difference between age and youth; but this difference, which is necessary, must be limited as much as possible, must be cut down to its proper dimensions, and must by no means whatever be permitted to exaggerate itself into an artificial magnitude. If it do so, it is worse than a simple speculative error,—it is a mischievous delusion: it engenders a pernicious procrastination, justifies supineness, and creates an excuse for the neglect of opportunities: it wastes time, which is bad, and encourages self-deception, which is worse.

A difference between old practitioners and beginners there always will be: but it should consist not so much in the quality of their work as in the ease with which it is done. It should be the gain of the practitioner, not the loss of the patient.

Now, if I did those whom I have the honour to address the injustice of supposing that the moral reasons for disciplinal preparation, during the course of study now about to be entered into, were thrown away upon their minds and consciences, I should be at liberty to make short work of this part of my argument, and to dispose of much of it in a most brief and summary manner. I should be at liberty to say, in language more plain and complimentary, and more cogent than persuasive, that you *must* be up to your work when you begin it. If you stumble at the threshold, you have broken down for after-life. A blunder at the commencement is failure for the time to come. Furthermore; mala praxis is a misdemeanor in the eyes of the law, for which you may first be mulcted by a jury, and afterwards be gibbeted by the press. This fact, which there is no denying, ought to be conclusive against the preposterous doctrine which I have exposed: conclusive, however, as it is, it is one which I have not chosen to put prominent. Let a better feeling stand instead of it. Honesty is the best policy; but he is not honest who acts upon that policy only.

All this may be true; yet it may be said that the responsibility is prospective. "'Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof.' We'll think about this when we have got through the Halls and Colleges. You must give us better reasons for sacrificing our inclinations to our duty than those of a *paulo-post-futurum* responsibility." Be it so: you have still a duty, urgent and absolute — not prospective, but immediate — not in the distance, with contingent patients, but close at hand, with the realities of friend and family — not abroad with the public, but at home with your private circle of parents, relatives, and guardians. By them you are entrusted here with the special, definite, unequivocal, undoubted object — an object which no ingenuity can refine away, and no subtlety can demur to — of instruction, discipline, preparation. You not only *come* up here to learn, but you are *sent* up to do so: and anxious wishes and reasonable hopes accompany you. You are commissioned to avail yourself of a time which experience has shewn to be sufficient, and of opportunities which are considered necessary: and there is no excuse for neglect.

Great as are the opportunities, they are not numerous enough to be wasted; and limited as is the time in the eyes of those who only know it in its misapplication, it is the period that a considerable amount of experience has sanctioned as a fair and average time for fair and average abilities, and for fair and average industry: — not a *minimum* period made

for iron assiduity on the one hand, or for fiery talent on the other, but a period adapted to the common capacities of the common mass of mankind — a common-sense time, — a time too long or too short only for the extremes of intellect — too short for the slowness of confirmed dulness, too long for the rapid progress of extraordinary and rarely-occurring genius.

Of this time you are bound to make the most. It is your interest to do so for your own sakes; it is your duty to do so for the sake of your friends.

You come to the hospital to *learn* — you come to the hospital to learn in the strictest sense of the word. You come to learn medicine, as you would go — if instead of physic your profession were the law — to the chambers of a special pleader, a common lawyer, or an equity draughtsman. In this strict sense does your presence here imply study — study exclusive, and study without any loss of time, and without any division of attention. You do not come here as a clergyman goes to the University; but as artists go to Rome — not to keep terms, but to do work.

I must here guard against the misinterpretation of an expression used a few sentences back. I wish to let nothing drop that may encourage the germs of an undue presumption. I expressed an opinion — which I meant to be a decided one — that the time allowed for your medical studies was full, fair, and sufficient, — so much so that if it prove *in*sufficient the fault must lie in the neglect of it. *Sufficient*, however, as it is, it gives no opportunity for any superfluous leisure. It must not be presumed on. You have no odd months, or weeks, or days, or even hours, to play with. It is a sufficient space for you to lay in that knowledge of your profession which the experience and opinion of your examining boards have thought proper to require. I believe the amount thus required, to be, like the time granted for the acquisition of it, a fair amount. But it is not a high one, and it is not right that it should be so. Standards of fitness that are set up for the measure of a body of students so numerous as those in medicine, rarely err on the side of severity. They favour mediocrity; and they ought to favour it. It is safe: and that is all they have a right to look to. What they profess is never very formidable; and what they require is generally less than what is professed. But the time that is sufficient for this *modicum* (or *minimum*) of professional learning is not the time sufficient for the formation of a practitioner of that degree of excellence which the competition of an open profession, like that of medicine, requires as the guarantee of success. An examining board has but one point

too look to — it must see that you can practise with safety to the public. It never ensures, or professes to ensure, that you shall practise with success to yourself, or even that you shall practise at all. In the eyes of an Examiner, as in those of a commissioner of lunacy, there are but two sorts of individuals; those that can be let loose upon the public, and those that cannot. In the eyes of the public there is every degree of excellence, and every variety of comparative merit or demerit.

Now as to the way of attaining these higher degrees of merit, and the rewards, moral or material, which they ensure — which follow them as truly as satisfaction follows right actions, and as penalties follow wrong ones. The opportunity we have spoken of. It consists in the whole range of means and appliances by which we here, and others elsewhere, avail ourselves of those diseases that humanity has suffered, and is suffering, for the sake of alleviating the misery that they seem to ensure for the future. Disease with us is not only an object of direct and immediate relief to the patient who endures it, but it is an indirect means of relief to sufferers yet untouched. Out of evil comes good. We make the sick helpful to the sound; the dead available to the living. Out of pestilence comes healing, and out of the corruption of death the laws and rule of life. Suffering we have, and teaching we have, and neither must be lost upon you. It is too late to find that these objects, and objects like them, are repugnant and revolting. These things should have been thought of before. Your choice is now taken, and it must be held to. The discovery that learning is unpleasant is the discovery of a mistake in the choice of your profession; and the sooner you remedy such a mistake the better — the better for yourselves, the better for your friends, the better for the public, and the better for the profession itself.

Steady work, with fair opportunities — this is what makes practitioners. The one without the other is insufficient. There is an expenditure of exertion where your industry outruns your materials, and there is a loss of useful facts when occasions for observation are neglected.

See all you can, and hear all you can. It is not likely that cases will multiply themselves for your special observations, and it is neither the policy nor the practice of those who are commissioned with your instruction to open their mouths at random.

See all you can. If the case be a common one, you get so much familiarity with a phenomenon that it will be conti-

nually presenting itself. If a rare one, you have seen what you may seldom see again. There is every reason for taking the practice of the hospital exactly as you find it. It represents the diseases of the largest class of mankind — the poor; and, although in some of the details there may be a difference, upon the whole the forms of disease that are the commonest in hospitals are the commonest in the world at large; and *vice versâ*. Hence, what you see here is the rule rather than the exception for what you will see hereafter. The diseases are not only essentially the same, but the proportion which they bear to one another is nearly so. I mention this, because there is often a tendency to run after rare cases to the neglect of common ones; whilst, on the other hand, remarkable and instructive forms of disease are overlooked, simply because they are thought the curiosities rather than the elements of practice. You may carry your neglect of common cases, on the strength of their being common, too far. You may know all about catalepsy and hydrophobia, and nothing about itch or measles. You may find that, of the two parties concerned, the patient and yourself, it is the former that knows the most about his complaint. You may live to have your diagnosis corrected by the porter, your prognosis criticised by the nurse. On the other hand, by missing single instances of rare disease, you may miss the opportunity of being able to refer to your memory rather than to your library.

I have given you reasons against being afraid of over-observation, and against the pernicious habit of neglecting this case because it is common, and that because it is rare — a common excuse for neglecting *all* diseases, and a popular reason for doing so. *Medicus sum, nihil in re medicâ a me alienum puto*, &c. Some minds, indeed, are so constituted that they can make much, very much, out of single cases, out of solitary specimens of diseases. The power of minute analysis is the characteristic of this sort of observation. It is just possible so to seize upon the true conditions of a disease, as to satisfy yourself, once for all, of its real permanent attribute — of its essence, if I may so express myself. And this being seen, you may, for certain purposes, have seen enough; seen it at one glance; seen it at a single view as well as others see it at a hundred. I say that certain minds are thus constituted; but they are rarely the minds of many men in a single generation, and never the minds of beginners. Before this power is attained your observation must be disciplined into the accuracy and the rapidity of an instinct; and to this power of observation — attainable only

by long practice, and after long practice — a high power of reflection must be superadded.

No such power must be presumed on. If the student delude himself, the disease will undeceive him. The best practitioners, in the long run, are those whose memory is stored with the greatest number of individual cases — individual cases well observed, and decently classified. It is currently stated that the peculiar power of the late Sir Astley Cooper was a power of memory of this sort, and I presume that no better instance of its value need be adduced. Now the memory for cases implies the existence of cases to remember; and before you arrange them in the storehouse of your thoughts you must have seen and considered; must have used both your senses and your understanding; must have seen, touched, and handled with the one, and must have understood and reflected with the other.

I am talking of these things as they exist in disciplined intellects, and in retentive memories; and, perhaps, it may be objected that I am talking of things that form the exception rather than the rule; that I am measuring the power of common men by those of extraordinary instances. I weigh my words, when I deliberately assert, that such, although partially the case, is not so altogether; and that it is far less the case than is commonly imagined. In most of those instances where we lose the advantage of prior experience, by omitting the application of our knowledge of a previous similar case, the fault is less in the laxity of memory than in the original incompleteness of the observation. Observe closely, and ponder well, and the memory may take care of itself. Like a well-applied nick-name, a well-made observation will stick to you — whether you look after it or neglect it. The best way to learn to swim is to try to sink, and it is so because floatation, like memory, is natural if you set about it rightly. Let those who distrust their remembrance once observe closely, and then forget if they can.

There are good reasons for cultivating this habit at all times, but there are especial reasons why those who are on the threshold of their profession should more particularly cultivate it. Not because you have much to learn — we have all that — nor yet because you have the privilege of great opportunities — we have all that also — must you watch, and reflect, and arrange, and remember. Your time of life gives you an advantage. The age of the generality of you is an age when fresh facts are best seized; and best seized because they are fresh. Whether you are prepared to understand their whole import, as you may do at some future

period, is doubtful. It is certain that the effect of their novelty is to impress them more cogently on your recollection.

And this is practice — practice in the good sense of the term, and in a sense which induces me to guard against the misconstruction of a previous application of it. A few sentences back I used the phrases *practical men*, adding that those so called were men who could be taught by practice only. I confess that this mode of expression was disparaging. For the purpose to which it was applied it was meant to be so. It is a term you must be on your guard against. *Practice* is so good a thing of itself that its name and appellation are applied to many bad things. Slovenliness is practice, if it suits the purpose of any one to call it so; contempt for reading is practice; and bleeding on all occasions when you omit to purge is practice; — and bad practice too. Be on your guard against this: but do not be on your guard against another sort of practice: the practice of men who first observe, and then reflect, and then generalise, and then reduce to a habit their results. This is the true light for you to follow, and in this sense practice is not only *a* safe guide but *the* safe guide. It is experience, or, if you choose a more philosophic term, induction. Theoretical men can be taught by this, and the wisest theories *are* taught by it. When I said that practical men were taught by practice only, I never implied that they were the only men that practice could teach. Experience makes fools wise; but fools are not the only persons who can profit by experience.

See and hear — the senses must administer to the understanding. Eye, and ear, and finger — exercise these that they may bring in learning.

See and hear—the senses must administer to their own improvement. Eye, and ear, and finger — exercise these, that they may better themselves as instruments. The knowledge is much, but the discipline is more. The knowledge is the fruit that is stored, but the discipline is the tree that yields. The one is the care that keeps, the other the cultivation that supplies.

The habit of accurate observation is by no means so difficult as is darkly signified by logicians, nor yet so easy as is vainly fancied by empirics. It is the duty of those who teach you to indicate the medium.

The tenor of some of my observations runs a risk of misrepresentation. It has been limited. It has spoken of cases, as if there was nothing in the whole range of medical study but cases; and of observation, as if the faculties of a medical man were to take a monomaniac form, and to run upon

observation only; of hospitals, as if they consisted of beds and patients alone; and of clinical medicine and of clinical surgery, as if there was no such a paramount subject as physiology, and no such important subsidiary studies as chemistry and botany. It is all hospital and no school—all wards and no museum—all sickness and no health. This has been the line that I have run on; and I feel that it may be imputed to me that I have run on it too long and too exclusively. Whether I undervalue the acquisition of those branches of knowledge which are collateral and subordinate to medicine, rather than the elements of medicine itself — which are the approaches to the temple rather than the innermost shrine — will be seen in the sequel. At present I only vindicate the prominence which has been given to clinical observation, by insisting upon the subordinate character of everything that is taught away from the bed, and beyond the sensible limits of disease. No single subject thus taught is the direct and primary object of your learning. The art of healing is so. You learn other things that you may understand this; and in hospitals at least you learn them with that view exclusively. If you wish to be a physiologist, chemist, or botanist, irrespectively of the medical application of the sciences of physiology, chemistry, and botany, there are better schools than the Middlesex Hospital, or, indeed, than any hospital whatever. *There* they may be studied as mathematics are studied at Cambridge, or as classics at Eton — simply for their own great and inherent values. But *here* you study them differently, that is, as mathematics are taught at a military college, or as classics are taught at the College of Preceptors, for a specific purpose, and with a limited view — with a view limited to the illustration of disease, and with the specific purpose of rendering them indirect agents in therapeutics. If you could contrive the cure of disease without a knowledge of morbid processes, it would be a waste of time to trouble yourself with pathology; or if you could bottom the phenomena of diseased action without a knowledge of the actions of health, physiology would be but a noble science for philosophers; or if you could build up a system of physiology, determining the functions of organs and the susceptibilities of tissues, independent of the anatomy of those organs and those tissues, scalpels would be as irrelevant to you as telescopes; and if these three sciences received no elucidation from chemistry, and botany, and physics, then would chemistry, and botany and physics, have the value — neither more nor less — of the art of criticism or of the binomial theorem. What you are taught in the schools is taught to you, not because it

is worth knowing — for Latin, and Greek, and Mathematics are worth knowing — but because, before patients can be cured, they are necessary to be learned.

And, in order to be taught at all, they must be taught systematically. It is an easy matter to ask for a certain amount of these two collateral sciences — to pick and choose just the parts wanted for use, to require just that *modicum* of botany which illustrates the Pharmacopœia, and just those fragments of chemistry that make prescriptions safe, and urine intelligible. It is easy, I say, to ask for all this; but the art of thus teaching *per saltum* has yet to be discovered. The whole is more manageable than the half. What it may be with others is more than I can tell; but, for my own particular teaching, I would sooner take the dullest boy from the worst school, and start him in a subject at the right end, than begin at the wrong end with the cleverest prize-man that ever flattered parent or gratified instructor. Bits of botany and crumbs of chemistry are less digestible than whole courses.

Thus much for those studies that make your therapeutics rational. Some few have spoken slightly of them — as Sydenham, in the fulness of his knowledge of symptoms, spoke slightingly of anatomy, or as a Greek sculptor, familiar with the naked figure, might dispense with dissection. They are necessary, nevertheless, for the groundwork of your practice. They must serve to underpin your observations.

And now we may ask, whether, when a medical education has been gone through, you have collected from it, over and above your professional sufficiency, any secondary advantages of that kind which are attributed to education itself taken in the abstract? Whether your knowledge is of the sort that elevates, and whether your training is of the kind that strengthens?

Upon the whole, you may be satisfied with the reflex action of your professional on your general education — that is, if you take a practical and not an ideal standard. It will do for you, in this way, as much as legal studies do for the barrister, and as much as theological reading does for the clergyman; and perhaps in those points not common to the three professions medicine has the advantage. Its chemistry, which I would willingly see more mixed with physics, carries you to the threshold of the exact sciences. Its botany is pre-eminently disciplinal to the faculty of classification; indeed, for the natural-history sciences altogether, a medical education is almost necessary. Clear ideas in physiology are got at only through an exercised power of abstraction

and generalization. The phenomena of insanity can be appreciated only when the general phenomena of healthy mental function are understood, and when the normal actions of the mind are logically analyzed. Such is medical education as an instrument of self-culture: and as education stands at present, a man who has made the most of them may walk among the learned men of the world with a bold and confiding front.

I insist upon thus much justice being done to the intellectual character of my profession — viz. that it be measured by a practical, and not an ideal, standard. Too much of the spirit of exaggeration is abroad — of that sort of exaggeration which makes men see in the requisites for their own profession the requisites for half-a-dozen others — of that sort of exaggeration which made Vitruvius, himself an architect, prove elaborately that before a man could take a trowel in his hand he must have a knowledge of all the sciences and a habit of all the virtues. Undoubtedly it would elevate medicine for every member in the profession to know much more than is required of him — yet this is no reason for our requiring much more than we do. Such a notion can be entertained only through a confusion of duty on the part of those who direct medicine. Their business is the public safety; and the position of their profession is their business *only* so far as it affects this. Trusts are intended for the benefit of any one rather than the trustee.

Two objections lie against the recommendation of extraneous branches of learning in medicine: in the first place, by insisting upon them as elements of a special course of instruction, they are, by implication, excluded from a general one; in the second place, they are no part of a three years' training.

Concentrate your attention on the essentials. I am quite satisfied that as far as the merits or demerits of an education contribute to the position of a profession, we may take ours as we find it, and yet hold our own. Nevertheless, lest the position given to medicine by its pre-eminent prominence, in conjunction with the church and bar, as one of the so-called learned professions, should encourage the idea that a multiplicity of accomplishments should be the character of a full and perfect medical practitioner, one or two important realities in respect to our position should be indicated. We are at a disadvantage as compared with both the church and the bar. We have nothing to set against such great political prizes as chancellorships and archbishoprics. We are at this disadvantage; and, in a country like England, it is

a great one: so that what we gain by the connection, in the eyes of the public, is more than what we give; and the connection is itself artificial, and, as such, dissoluble. It is best to look the truth in the face—we must stand or fall by our own utility.

Proud to be useful—scorning to be more

— must be the motto of him whose integrity should be on a level with his skill, who should win a double confidence, and who, if he do his duty well, is as sure of his proper influence in society, and on society — and that influence a noble one — as if he were the member of a profession ensured to respectability by all the favours that influence can extort, and all the prerogatives that time can accumulate. As compared with that of the church and bar, our hold upon the public is by a thread — but it is the thread of life.

Such are the responsibilities, the opportunities, and the prospects, of those who are now about to prepare themselves for their future career. We who teach have our responsibilities also; we know them; we are teaching where Bell taught before us; we are teaching where ground has been lost; yet we are also teaching with good hopes, founded upon improved auguries.

ON THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE AS A BRANCH OF EDUCATION.

A LECTURE DELIVERED AT THE ROYAL INSTITUTION OF GREAT BRITAIN.

MAY 13, 1854.

The subject I have the honour of illustrating is The Importance of the Study of Language as a means of Education for all Classes.

I open it by drawing a distinction.

A little consideration will show that that difference between the study of a given subject in its general and abstract, and the study of one in its applied or concrete, form, which finds place in so many departments of human knowledge, finds place in respect to Language and Languages. It finds place in the subject before us as truly as it does in that science, which one of my able successors will have the honour of illustrating, — the science of the laws of Life — Physiology or Biology. Just as there is, therein, a certain series of laws relating to life and organization, which would command our attention, if the whole animal and vegetable world consisted of but a single species, so the study of Speech would find place in a well-devised system of education, even if the tongues of the whole wide world were reduced to a single language, and that language to a single dialect. This is because the science of life is one thing, the science of the forms under which the phenomena of life are manifested, another. And just as Physiology, or Biology, is, more or less, anterior to and independent of such departments of study as Botany and Zoology, so, in the subject under notice, there is the double division of the study of *Language* in respect to structure and development, and the study of *Languages* as instances of the variety of form in which the phenomenon of human speech exhibits, or has exhibited, itself. Thus —

When (as I believe once to have been the case) there was

but a single language on the face of the earth, the former of these divisions had its subject-matter. And —

When (as is by no means improbable) one paramount and exclusive tongue, developed, at first, rapidly and at the expense of the smaller languages of the world, and, subsequently, slowly and at that of the more widely-diffused ones, shall have replaced the still numerous tongues of the nineteenth century; and when all the dialects of the world shall be merged into one Universal Language, the same subject-matter for the study of the structure of Language, its growth and changes, will still exist.

So that the study of Language is one thing, the study of Languages, another.

They are different; and the intellectual powers that they require and exercise are different also. The greatest comparative philologists have, generally, been but moderate linguists.

A certain familiarity with different languages they have, of course, had; and as compared with that of the special scholar — the Classic or the Orientalist, for instance — their range of language (so to say) has been a wide one; but it has rarely been of that vast compass which is found in men after the fashion of Mezzofanti, &c.—men who have spoken languages by the dozen, or the score; — but who have left comparative philology as little advanced as if their learning had been bounded by the limits of their own mother tongue.

Now this difference, always of more or less importance in itself, increases when we consider Language as an object of education; and it is for the sake of illustrating it that the foregoing preliminaries have been introduced. No opinion is given as to the comparative rank or dignity of the two studies; no decision upon the nobility or ignobility of the faculties involved in the attainment of excellence in either. The illustration of a difference is all that has been aimed at. There is a difference between the two classes of subjects, and a difference between the two kinds of mental faculties. Let us make this difference clear. Let us also give it prominence and importance.

One main distinction between the study of Language and the study of Languages lies in the fact of the value of the former being *constant*, that of the latter, *fluctuating*. The relative importance of any two languages, as objects of special attention, scarcely ever remains steady. The value, for instance, of the German — to look amongst the cotemporary forms of speech — has notably risen within the present century. And why? Because the literature in which it is em-

bodied has improved. Because the scientific knowledge which, to all who want the key, is (so to say) locked up in it, has increased some hundred per cent.

But it may go down again. Suppose, for instance, that new writers of pre-eminent merit, ennoble some of the minor languages of Europe — the Danish, Swedish, Dutch, &c. Such a fact would divide the attention of *savans* — attention which can only be bestowed upon some second, at the expense of some first, object. In such a case, the extent to which the German language got studied would be affected much in the same way as that of the French has been by the development of the literature of Germany.

Or the area over which a language is spoken may increase; as it may, also, diminish.

Or the number of individuals that speak it may multiply — the area being the same.

Or the special application of the language, whether for the purposes of commerce, literature, science, or politics, may become changed. In this way, as well as in others, the English is becoming, day by day, more important.

There are other influences.

High as is the value of the great classical languages of Greece and Rome, we can easily conceive how that value might be enhanced. Let a manuscript containing the works of some of the lost, or imperfectly preserved, writers of antiquity be discovered. Let, for instance, Gibbon's *desiderata* — the lost *Decads of Livy*, the *Orations of Hyperides*, or the *Dramas of Menander* — be made good. The per-centage of classical scholars would increase; little or much.

Some years back it was announced that the Armenian language contained translations, made during the earlier centuries of our era, of certain classical writings, of which the originals had been lost — lost in the interval. This did not exactly make the Armenian, with its alphabet of six-and-thirty letters, a popular tongue; but it made it, by a fraction, more popular than it was in the days of Whiston and La Croze, when those two alone, of all the learned men of Europe, could read it.

Translations tell in another way. Whatever is worth reading in the Danish and Swedish is forthwith translated into German. *E. g.* Professor Retzius of Stockholm wrote a good Manual of Anatomy. He had the satisfaction of seeing it translated into German. He had the further satisfaction of hearing that the translation ran through five editions in less time than the original did through one.

Now, if the Germans were to leave off translating the

value of the language in which Professor Retzius wrote his Anatomy would rise.

Upon the whole, the French is, perhaps, the most important language of the nineteenth century; yet it is only where we take into consideration the whole of its elements of value. To certain special *savans*, the German is worth more; to the artist, the Italian; to the American, the Spanish. It fell, too, in value when nations like our own insisted upon the use of their native tongues in diplomacy. It fell in value because it became less indispensable; and another cause, now in operation, affects the same element of indispensability. The French are beginning to learn the languages of other nations. Their own literature will certainly be none the worse for their so doing. But it by no means follows that that literature will be any the more studied. On the contrary, Frenchmen will learn English more, and, *pro tanto*, Englishmen learn French less.

If all this have illustrated a difference, it may also have done something more. It may have given a rough sketch, in the way of classification, of the kind of facts that regulate the value of special languages as special objects of study. At any rate (and this is the main point), the subject-matter of the present Address is narrowed. It is narrowed (in the first instance at least) to the consideration of that branch of study whereof the value is constant; for assuredly it is this which will command more than a moiety of our consideration.

This may be said to imply a preference to the study of Language as opposed to that of Languages — a *singular* preference, as a grammarian may, perhaps, be allowed to call it. It cannot be denied that, to a certain extent, such is the case; but it is only so to a certain extent. The one is not magnified at the expense of the other. When all has been said that logic or mental philosophy can say about the high value of comparative philology, general grammar, and the like, the lowest value of the least important language will still stand high, and pre-eminently high that of what may be called the *noble* Languages. No variations in the philological barometer, no fluctuations in the Exchange of Language, will ever bring down the advantage of studying one, two, or even more foreign languages to so low a level as to expel such tongues as the Latin, the Greek, the French, or the German, one and all, from an English *curriculum* — and *vice versâ*, English from a foreign one.

Now, if this be the case, one of the elements in the value of the *study of Language in general* will be the extent to which it facilitates the acquirement of any one language

in particular, and this element of value will be an important — though not the most important — one.

The structure of the human body is worth knowing, even if the investigator of it be neither a practitioner in medicine nor a teacher of anatomy; and, in like manner, the structure of the human language is an important study irrespective of the particular forms of speech whereof it may facilitate the acquirement.

The words on the diagram-board will now be explained. They are meant to illustrate the class of facts that comparative philology supplies.

The first runs —

Klein : Clean :: Petit : Petitus.

It shows the extent to which certain ideas are associated. It shows, too, something more; it shows that such an association is capable of being demonstrated from the phenomena of language instead of being a mere *à priori* speculation on the part of the mental philosopher.

Klein is the German for *little*; *clean* is our own English adjective, the English of the Latin word *mundus*. In German the word is *rein*.

Now, notwithstanding the difference of meaning in the two tongues, *clean* and *klein* are one and the same word. Yet, how are the ideas of *cleanliness* and *littleness* connected? The Greek language has the word *hypocorisma*, meaning a *term of endearment*, and the adjective *hypocoristic*. Now, *clean-ness*, or *neat-ness*, is one of the elements that make *hypocoristic* terms (or terms of endearment) applicable. And so is *smallness*. We talk of *pretty little dears*, a thousand times, where we talk of *pretty big dears* once. This, then, explains the connexion; this tells us that *clean* in English is *klein* in German, word for word.

You doubt it, perhaps. You shake your head, and say, that the connexion seems somewhat indefinite; that it is just one of those points which can neither be proved nor disproved. Be it so. The evidence can be amended. Observe the words *petit* and *petitus*. *Petit* (in French) is exactly what *klein* is in German, *i. e.*, *little*. *Petitus* (in Latin) is very nearly what *clean* is in English, *i. e.*, *desired*, or *desirable*. That *petit* comes from *petitus* is undeniable.

Hence, where the German mode of thought connects the ideas of *smallness* and *cleanness*, the Latin connects those of *smallnes* and *desirability;* so that as *petit* is to *petitus*, so is *klein* to *clean*. In the diagram this is given in the formula of a sum in the Rule of Three.

The words just noticed explain the connexion of ideas in the case of separate words. The forthcoming help us in a much more difficult investigation. What is the import of such sounds as that of the letter *s* in the word father-*s*? It is the sign of the plural number.

Such is the question — such the answer; question and answer connected in the word *fathers* solely for the sake of illustration. Any other word, and any other sign of case, number, person, or tense, would have done as well.

But *is* the answer a real one? Is it an answer at all? How come such things as plural numbers, and signs of plural numbers, into language? How the particular plural before us came into being, I cannot say; but I can show how *some* plurals have. Let us explain the following —

Ngi = *I*. *Ngi-n-de* = *we*.
Ngo = *thou*. *Ngo-n-da* = *ye*.
Ngu = *he*. *Nge-n-da* = *they*.
Da = *with*.
Me-cum = *me*.

The *da* (or *de*) in the second column, is the sign of the plural number in a language which shall at present be nameless. It is also the preposition *with*. Now *with* denotes *association;* association *plurality*. Hence

Ngi-n-de = *I* + = *we*.
Ngo-n-da = *thou* + = *ye*.
Nge-n-da = *he* + = *they*.

This is just as if the Latins, instead of *nos* and *vos*, said *me-cum* and *te-cum*.

Such is the history of one mode of expressing the idea of plurality; we can scarcely say of a *plural number*. The words *plural number* suggest the idea of a single word, like *fathers*, where the *s* is inseparably connected with the root; at least so far inseparably connected as to have no independent existence of its own. *Ngi-n-de*, however, is no single word at all, but a pair of words in juxta-position, each with a separate existence of its own. But what if this juxta-position grow into *amalgamation;* What if the form in *da* change? What if it become *t* or *z*, or *th*, or *s*? What if, meanwhile, the separate preposition *da* change in form also; in form or meaning, or, perhaps, in both? In such a case a true plural form is evolved, the history of its evolution being a mystery.

So much for one of the inflections of a *noun*. The remaining words illustrate one of a *verb*.

Hundreds of grammarians have suggested that the signs of the *persons* in the verb might be neither more nor less than the personal pronouns *appended*, in the first instance, to the verb, but, afterwards amalgamated or incorporated with it. If so, the *-m* in *inqua-m*, is the *m* in *me*, &c. The late Mr. Garnett, a comparative philologist whose reputation is far below his merits, saw that this was not exactly the case. He observed that the appended pronoun was not so much the *Personal* as the *Possessive* one: that the analysis of a word like *inqua-m* was not so much, *say* + *I*, as *saying* + *my;* in short, that the verb was a noun, and the pronoun either an adjective (like *meus*) or an oblique case (like *mei*), agreeing with, or governed by, it.

It is *certainly* so in the words before you. In a language, which, at present, shall be nameless, instead of saying *my apple*, *thy apple*, they say what is equivalent to *apple-m*, *apple-th*, &c.; *i. e.*, they append the possessive pronoun to the substantive, and by modifying its form, partially incorporate or amalgamate it. They do more than this. They do (as the diagram shows us) precisely the same with the verbs in their *personal*, as they do with the nouns in their *possessive*, relations. Hence, *olvas-om*, &c., is less *I read* than *my-reading;* less *read* + *I*, than *reading* + *my*.

1.

Olvas—om	= *I read.*	= *reading-my.*
— *od*	= *thou readest.*	= *reading-thy.*
— *uk*	= *we read.*	= *reading-our.*
— *atok*	= *ye read.*	= *reading-your.*

2.

Almá—m	= *my apple.*	= *apple-my.*
— *d*	= *thy apple.*	= *apple-thy.*
— *nk*	= *our apple.*	= *apple-our.*
— *tok*	= *your apple.*	= *apple-your.*

I submit, that facts of this kind are of some value, great or small. But the facts themselves are not all. How were they got at? They were got at by dealing with the phenomena of language as we found them, by an induction of no ordinary width and compass; for many forms of speech had to be investigated before the facts came out in their best and most satisfactory form.

The illustration of the verb (*olvasom*, and *almám*, &c.) is from the Hungarian; that of the plural number (*nginde*, &c.), from the Tumali—the Tumali being a language no nearer

than the negro districts to the south of Kordovan, between Sennaar and Darfur, and (as such) not exactly in the high-way of literature and philology.

Now I ask whether there be, or whether there be not, certain branches of inquiry which are, at one and the same time, recognised to be of the highest importance, and yet not very remarkable for either unanimity of opinion, precision of language, or distinctness of idea on the part of their professors. I ask whether what is called, with average clearness, Mental Philosophy, and, with somewhat less clearness, Metaphysics, be not in this predicament? I ask whether, in this branch of investigation, the subject-matter do not eminently desiderate something definite, palpable, and objective, and whether these same desiderated tangibilities be not found in the wide field of Language to an extent which no other field supplies? Let this field be a training-ground. The facts it gives are of value. The method it requires is of value.

As the languages of the world, as the forms of speech mutually unintelligible, are counted by the hundred, and the dialects by the thousand, the field is a large one — one supplying much exercise, work, and labour. But the applications of the results obtained are wide also; for, as long as any form of mental philosophy remains susceptible of improvement, as long as its improved form remains undiffused, so long will a knowledge of the structure of language in general, a knowledge of comparative philology, a knowledge of general grammar (for we may choose our term), have its use and application. And, assuredly, this will be for some time.

As to its special value in the particular department of the ethnologist, high as it is, I say nothing, or next to nothing, about it; concerning myself only with its more general applications.

Let it be said, then, that the study of language is eminently disciplinal to those faculties that are tasked in the investigation of the phenomena of the human mind; the value of a knowledge of these being a matter foreign to the present dissertation, but being by no means low. High or low, however, it measures that of the studies under notice.

But how is this general philology to be taught? Are youths to seek for roots and processes in such languages as the Hungarian and the Tumali? No. The teaching must be by means of well-selected suggestive examples, whereby the student may rise from particulars to generals, and be taught to infer the uncertain from the certain. I do not say that the *s* in *fathers* arose exactly after the fashion of the Tumali plural; but, assuredly, its development was the same in

kind, if not in detail. At all events, language must be dealt with as a *growth*.

In the first stage of speech, there are no inflections at all, separate words serving instead of them: — just as if, instead of saying *fathers*, we said *father many*, or *father father;* reduplication being one of the make-shifts (so to say) of this period. The languages allied to the Chinese belong to this class.

In the second stage, the separate words coalesce, but not so perfectly as to disfigure their originally separate character. The Hungarian persons have illustrated this. Language now becomes what is called *agglutinate*. The parts cohere, but the cohesion is imperfect. The majority of languages are agglutinate.

The Latin and Greek tongues illustrate the third stage. The parts originally separate, then agglutinate, now become so modified by contact as to look like secondary parts of a single word; these original separate substantive characters being a matter of inference rather than a patent and transparent fact. The *s* in *fathers* (which is also the *s* in *patre-s* and *πάτερε-ς*) is in this predicament.

Lastly, inflections are replaced by prepositions and auxiliary verbs, as is the case in the Italian and French when compared with the Latin.

Truly, then, may we say that the phenomena of speech are the phenomena of growth, evolution, or development; and as such must they be taught. A cell that grows, — not a crystal that is built up, — such is language.

But these well-devised selections of suggestive examples, whereby the student may rise from particulars to generals, &c., are not to be found in the ordinary grammars. Indeed, it is the very reverse of the present system; where there are twenty appeals to the memory in the shape of what is called a *rule*, for one appeal to the understanding in the shape of an illustrated process. So much the worse for the existing methods.

Moulds applied to growing trees — cookery-book receipts for making a natural juice — these are the parallels to the artificial systems of grammar *in their worst forms*. The *better* can be excused, sometimes recommended; even as the Linnæan system of botanical teaching can, in certain cases, be used with safety, *provided always that its artificial character be explained beforehand, and insisted on throughout.*

To stand on the level of the Linnæan system, an artificial grammar must come under the following condition: — *It must leave the student nothing to unlearn when he comes to a natural one.*

How can this be done? It can be done, if the grammarian will be content to teach *forms* only, leaving processes alone. Let him say (for instance) that the Latin for —

I call is *voc*-o.
Thou callest, *voc*-as.
Calling, *voc*-ans.
I called, *voc*-avi &c.

But do not let him say that active aorists are formed from futures, and passive ones from the third person singular of the perfect. His forms, his paradigms, will be right; his rules, in nine cases out of ten, wrong. I am satisfied that languages can be taught without rules and by paradigms only.

This recognition of what has been called *artificial* grammar for the teaching of special languages, as opposed to the general grammar of the comparative philologist, should serve to anticipate an objection. 'Would you,' it may be asked, 'leave the details of languages like the Latin, Greek, French, German, &c. — languages of eminent practical utility — untaught until such time as the student shall have dipped into Chinese, touched upon Hungarian, and taken a general idea of the third stage of development from the Latin, and of the fourth from the French? If so, the period of life when the memory for words is strongest will have passed away before any language but his own mother-tongue has been acquired.'

The recognition of such a thing as artificial grammar answers this in the negative. If a special language be wanted, let it be taught by-times: only, if it cannot be taught in the most scientific manner, let it be taught in a manner as little unscientific as possible.

In this lies an argument against the ordinary teaching (I speak as an Englishman) of English. What do we learn by it?

In the ordinary teaching of what is called the grammar of the English language there are two elements. There is something professed to be taught which is not taught, but which, if taught, would be worth learning; and there is something which, from being already learned better than any man can teach it, requires no lessons. The one (the latter) is the use and practice of the English tongue. This the Englishman has already. The other is the principles of grammar. With existing text-books this is an impossibility. What then *is* taught? Something (I am quoting from what I have written elsewhere) undoubtedly. The facts, that language is more or less regular; that there *is* such a thing

as grammar; that certain expressions should be avoided, are all matters worth knowing. And they are all taught even by the worst method of teaching. But are these the proper objects of *systematic* teaching? Is the importance of their acquisition equivalent to the time, the trouble, and the displacement of more valuable subjects, which are involved in their explanation? I think not. Gross vulgarity of language is a fault to be prevented; but the proper prevention is to be got from habit — not rules. The proprieties of the English language are to be learned, like the proprieties of English manners, by conversation and intercourse; and a proper school for both, is the best society in which the learner is placed. If this be good, systematic teaching is superfluous; if bad, insufficient. There *are* undoubted points where a young person may doubt as to the grammatical propriety of a certain expression. In this case let him ask some one older and more instructed. Grammar, as a *art*, is, undoubtedly, *the art of speaking and writing correctly* — but then, as an *art*, it is only required for *foreign* languages. For our *own* we have the necessary practice and familiarity.

The true claim of English grammar to form part and parcel of an English education stands or falls with the value of the philological knowledge to which grammatical studies may serve as an introduction, and with the value of scientific grammar as a *disciplinal* study. I have no fear of being supposed to undervalue its importance in this respect. Indeed, in assuming that it is very great, I also assume that wherever grammar is studied as grammar, the language which the grammar so studied should represent, must be the mother-tongue of the student; *whatever that mother-tongue may be* — English for Englishmen, Welsh for Welshmen, French for Frenchmen, German for Germans, &c. The study is the study of a theory; and for this reason it should be complicated as little as possible by points of practice. For this reason a man's mother-tongue is the best medium for the elements of scientific philology, simply because it is the one which he knows best in practice.

Limit, then, the teaching of English, except so far as it is preparatory to the study of language in general; with which view, teach as scientifically as possible.

Go further. Except in special cases, limit the teaching of the classical tongues to one out of the two. *One*, for all *disciplinal* purposes, is enough. In this, go far. Dead though the tongue be, and object of ridicule as the occupation is becoming, go to the length of writing verses, though only in a few of the commoner metres. Go far, and go in one

direction only. There are reasons for this singleness of path. I fear that there is almost a necessity. As long as men believed that the ordinary Latin and Greek grammars were good things of themselves, and that, even if they did not carry the student far into the classics, they told him something of value respecting language in general, a *little learning* in the dead languages was a good thing. But what if the grammars are *not* good things? What if they are absolutely bad? In such a case, the classical tongues cease to be learnt except for themselves. Now, one of the few things that is more useless than a little Latin is a little Greek.

Am I wrong in saying that, with nine out of ten who learn *both* Latin and Greek, the knowledge of the two tongues conjointly is not greater than the knowledge of one of them singly ought to be?

Am I wrong in believing that the tendencies of the age are in favour of decreasing rather than increasing the amount of time bestowed upon classical scholarship?

Unless I be so, the necessity for a limitation is apparent.

To curtail English — to eliminate one of the classical tongues — possibly that of Pericles, at any rate, either that of Pericles or of Cicero — to substitute for the ordinary elements of a so-called classical education illustrations from the Chinese, the Hungarian, or the Tumali — this is what I have recommended.

I cannot but feel that in so doing I may seem to some to have been false to my text, which was to eulogize things philological. They may say, *Call you this backing your friends?* I do. It is not by glorifying one's own more peculiar studies that such studies gain credit. To show the permanent, rather than the accidental, elements of their value, is the best service that can be done for them. It is also good service to show that they can be taught with a less expenditure of time and labour than is usually bestowed on them. But the best service of all is to indicate their disciplinal value; and to show that, instead of displacing other branches of knowledge, they so exercise certain faculties of the mind as to prepare the way to them.

II.

LOGICA.

ON THE WORD *DISTRIBUTED*, AS USED IN LOGIC.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

DECEMBER THE 18TH 1857.

The present paper is an attempt to reconcile the logical and etymological meanings of the word *Distributed*.

Speaking roughly, *distributed* means *universal:* "a term is said to be *distributed* when it is taken universally, so as to stand for everything it is capable of being applied to." — *Whately*, i. § 5.

Speaking more closely, it means *universal in one premiss;* it being a rule in the ordinary logic that no conclusion is possible unless one premiss be, either negatively or affirmatively, universal.

Assuredly there is no etymological connexion between the two words. Hence De Morgan writes: — "By *distributed* is here meant *universally spoken of*. I do not use this term in the present work, because I do not see why, in any deducible meaning of the word *distributed*, it can be applied to universal as distinguished from particular." — *Formal Logic*, chap. vii.

Neither can it be so applied. It is nevertheless an accurate term.

Let it mean *related to more than one class*, and the power of the prefix *dis-*, at least, becomes intelligible.

For *all* the purposes of logic this is not enough; inasmuch as the particular character of the relation (all-important in the structure of the syllogism) is not, at present, given. It is enough, however, to give import to the syllable *dis-*.

In affirmative propositions this relation is connective on both sides, *i. e.* the middle term forms part of *both* the others. In negative propositions this relation is connective on *one* side, disjunctive on the *other*.

In— All men are mortal,
All heroes are men,

the middle term *men* forms a part of the class called *mortal*, by being connected with it in the way that certain contents are connected with the case that contains them; whilst it also stands in connexion with the class of *heroes* in the way that cases are connected with their contents. In —

No man is perfect,
Heroes are men,

the same double relation occurs. The class *man*, however, though part of the class *hero*, is no part of the class *perfect* but, on the contrary, expressly excluded from it. Now this expression of exclusion constitutes a relation — disjunctive indeed, but still a relation; and this is all that is wanted to give an import to the prefix *dis-* in *distributed*.

Wherever there is distribution there is inference, no matter whether the distributed term be universal or not. If the ordinary rules for the structure of the syllogism tell us the contrary to this, they only tell the truth, so far as certain assumptions on which they rest are legitimate. These limit us to the use of three terms expressive of quantity, — *all*, *none*, and *some;* and it is quite true that, with this limitation, universality and distribution coincide.

Say that Some Y is X,
Some Z is Y,

and the question will arise whether the Y that is X is also the Y that is Z. That *some* Y belongs to both classes is clear; whether, however, it be the same Y is doubtful. Yet unless it be so, no conclusion can be drawn. And it may easily be different. Hence, as long as we use the word *some*, we have no assurance that there is any distribution of the middle term.

Instead, however, of *some* write *all*, and it is obvious that some Y must be both X and Z; and when such is the case —

Some X must be Z, and
Some Z must be X.

Universality, then, of the middle term in one premiss is, by no means, the *direct* condition that gives us an inference, but only a *secondary* one. The direct condition is the distribution. Of this, the universality of the middle term is only a *sign*, and it is the only sign we have, because *all* and *some* are the only words we have to choose from. If others were

allowed, the appearance which the two words (*distributed* and *universal*) have of being synonymous would disappear. And so they do when we abandon the limitations imposed upon us by the words *all* and *some*. So they do in the numerically definite syllogism, exemplified in —

More than half Y is X,
More than half Y is Z,
Some Z is X.

So, also, they do when it is assumed that the Y's which are X and the Y's which are Z are identical.

Y is X,
The same Y is Z,
Some Z is X.

In each of these formulæ there is distribution without universality, *i. e.* there is distribution with a quality other than that of universality as its criterion. The following extract not only explains this, but gives a fresh proof, if fresh proof be needed, that *distributed* and *universal* are used synonymously. The "comparison of each of the two terms must be equally with the whole, or with the same part of the third term; and to secure this, (1) either the middle term must be distributed in one premiss at least, or (2) the two terms must be compared with the same specified part of the middle, or (3), in the two premises taken together, the middle must be distributed, and something more, though not distributed in either singly." — *Thompson, Outline of the Laws of Thought*, § 39.

Here *distributed* means *universal;* Mr. Thompson's being the ordinary terminology. In the eyes of the present writer "distributed in one premiss" is a contradiction in terms.

Of the two terms, *distributed* is the more general; yet it is not the usual one. That it has been avoided by De Morgan has been shown. It may be added, that from the Port Royal Logic it is wholly excluded.

The statement that, in negative propositions, the relation is connective on *one* side, and disjunctive on the *other*, requires further notice. It is by no means a matter of indifference on which side the connexion or disjunction lies.

(*a.*) It is the class denoted by the major, of which the middle term of a negative syllogism is expressly stated to form *no* part, or from which it is disjoined. (*b.*) It is the class denoted by the minor, of which the same middle term is expressly stated to form part, or with which it is connected.

No man is perfect —

here the proposition is a major, and the middle term *man* is expressly separated from the class *perfect*.

All heroes are men —

here it is a minor, and the middle term *man* is expressly connected with class *hero*.

A connective relation to the major, and a disjunctive relation to the minor are impossible in negative syllogisms. The exceptions to this are only apparent. The two most prominent are the formulæ *Camestres* and *Camenes*, in both of which it is the minor premiss wherein the relation is disjunctive. But this is an accident; an accident arising out of the fact of the major and minor being convertible.

Bokardo is in a different predicament. *Bokardo*, along with *Baroko*, is the only formula containing a particular negative as a premiss. Now the particular negatives are, for so many of the purposes of logic, particular affirmatives, that they may be neglected for the present; the object at present being to ascertain the rules for the structure of truly and unquestionably negative syllogisms. Of these we may predicate that — their minor proposition is always either actually affirmative or capable of becoming so by transposition.

To go further into the relations between the middle term and the minor, would be to travel beyond the field under present notice; the immediate object of the present paper being to explain the import of the word *distributed*. That it may, both logically and etymologically, mean *related to two classes* is clear — clear as a matter of fact. Whether, however, *related to two classes* be the meaning that the history of logic gives us, is a point upon which I abstain from giving an opinion. I only suggest that, in elementary treatises, the terms *universal* and *distributed* should be separated more widely than they are; one series of remarks upon —

a. Distribution as a condition of inference, being followed by another on —

b. Universality of the middle term in one premiss as a sign of distribution.

So much for the extent to which the present remarks suggest the purely practical question as to how the teaching of Aristotelian logic may be improved. There is another, however, beyond it; one of a more theoretical, indeed of an eminently theoretical, nature. It raises doubts as to the propriety of the word *all* itself; doubts as to the propriety of the term *universal*.

The existence of such a word as *all* in the premiss, although existing therein merely as a contrivance for reconciling the evidence of the distribution of the middle term with a certain amount of simplicity in the way of terminology, could scarcely fail, in conjunction with some of its other properties, to give it what is here considered an undue amount of im-

portance. It made it look like the opposite to *none*. Yet this is what it is not. The opposite to *none* is *not-none*, or *some;* the opposite to *all* is *one*. In *one* and *all* we have the highest and lowest numbers of the individuals that constitute a class. In *none* and *some* we have the difference between existence and non-existence. That *all* is a mere mode of *some*, has been insisted on by many logicians, denied by few or none. Between *all* and *some*, there is, at best, but a difference of degree. Between *some* and *none*, the difference is a difference of kind. *Some* may, by strengthening, be converted into *all*. No strengthening may obliterate the difference between *all* and *not-all*. From this it follows that the logic of *none* and *some*, the logic of connexion and disjunction (the logic of *two* signs), is much more widely different from the logic of *part* and *whole* (the logic of *three* signs) than is usually admitted; the former being a logic of pure *quality*, the latter a logic of *quality* and *quantity* as well.

Has the admixture done good? I doubt whether it has. The logic of pure and simple Quality would, undoubtedly, have given but little; nothing but negative conclusions on one side, and possible particulars on the other. Nevertheless it would have given a logic of the Possible and Impossible.

Again, as at present constituted, the Quantitative logic, the logic of *all* and *some*, embraces either too much or too little. *All* is, as aforesaid, only a particular form of *more than none*. So is *most*. Now such syllogisms as —

Most men are fallible,
Most men are rational,
Some men are both frail and fallible;

or,

Some frail things are fallible,

are inadmissible in the Aristotelian paradigms. A claim, however, is set up for their admission. Grant it, and you may say instead of *most* —

Fifty-one per cent., &c.;

but this is only a particular instance. You may combine any two numbers in any way you like, provided only that the sum be greater than unity. Now this may be arithmetic, and it may be fact; but it is scarcely formal logic; at any rate it is anything but general.

It is the logic of *some* and its modifications *one*, *all*, and *anything between one and all*, as opposed to the logic of the simple absolute *some* (*some* the opposite to *none*), and a little consideration will show that it is also the logic of the *probable*, with its modification the *proven*, (*proven* is *probable*, as *all* is

some,) as opposed to the logic of the *possible* and *impossible*. Let, in such a pair of propositions as —

Some of the men of the brigade were brave,
Some of the men of the brigade were killed,

the number expressed by *some*, as well as the number of the men of the *brigade*, be known, and the question as to whether

Some brave men were killed,

is a problem in the doctrine of chances. One per cent. of each will make it very unlikely that the single brave man was also the single killed one. Forty-nine per cent. of each will make it highly probable that more than one good soldier met his fate. With fifty on one side, and fifty-one on the other, we have *one* at least. With *all* (either *killed* or *brave*), we have the same; and that without knowing any numbers at all.

III.

GRAMMATICA.

ON THE RECIPROCAL PRONOUNS,

AND

ON THE RECIPROCAL POWER OF THE REFLECTIVE VERB.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

MARCH 22. 1844.

The present paper is upon the reciprocal pronouns, and upon certain forms of the verb used in a reciprocal sense. It is considered that these points of language have not been put forwards with that prominence and care which their value in the solution of certain problems in philology requires. Too often the terms Reciprocal and Reflective have been made synonymous. How far this is true may be determined by the fact that the middle verbs in the Icelandic language have been called by so great a philologist as Rask *reciprocal* instead of *reflective*. This is equivalent to treating sentences like *we strike ourselves*, and *we strike each other*, as identical. Yet the language with which Rask was dealing (the Icelandic) was the one of all others wherein the difference in question required to be accurately drawn, and fully pointed out. (See Anvisning till Isländskan, pp. 281, 283.)

In all sentences containing the statement of a reciprocal or mutual action there are in reality two assertions, viz. the assertion that A *strikes* (or *loves*) B, and the assertion that B *strikes* (or *loves*) A; the action forming one, the reaction another. Hence, if the expression exactly coincided with the fact signified, there would always be two propositions. This, however, is not the habit of language. Hence arises a more

compendious form of expression, giving origin to an ellipsis of a peculiar kind. Phrases like *Eteocles and Polynices killed each other* are elliptical for *Eteocles and Polynices killed — each the other.* Here the second proposition expands and explains the first, whilst the first supplies the verb to the second. Each, however, is elliptic. The first is without the object, the second without the verb. That the verb must be in the plural (or dual) number, that one of the nouns must be in the nominative case, and that the other must be objective, is self-evident from the structure of the sentence; such being the conditions of the expression of the idea. An aposiopesis takes place after a plural verb, and then there follows a clause wherein the verb is supplied from what went before.

When words equivalent to *each other* coalesce, and become compound; it is evident that the composition is of a very peculiar kind. Less, however, for these matters than for its value in elucidating the origin of certain deponent verbs does the expression of reciprocal action merit the notice of the philologist. In the latter part of the paper it will appear that for one branch of languages, at least, there is satisfactory evidence of a reflective form having become reciprocal, and of a reciprocal form having become deponent; this latter word being the term for those verbs whereof the meaning is active, and the form passive.

Beginning with those methods of denoting mutual action where the expression is the least explicit and unequivocal, it appears that in certain languages the reciprocal character of the verb is implied rather than expressed. *Each man looked at his brother* — or some equivalent clause, is the general phraseology of the Semitic languages.

More explicit than this is the use of a single pronoun (personal, possessive, or reflective) and of some adverb equivalent to the words *mutually, interchangeably*, &c. This is the habit of the Latin language, — *Eteocles et Polynices invicem se trucidaverunt:* also of the French, although not invariably, e. g. *s'entr'aimer, s'entredire, s'entrebattre*: also of the Mœso-Gothic — galeikái sind barnam tháim vôpjandam seina *missô* = ὅμοιοί εἰσι παιδίοις τοῖς προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις = loquentibus ad invicem. — Luc. vii. 32. Deutsche Grammatik, iv. 322, and iii. 13. The Welsh expressions are of this kind; the only difference being that the adverb coalesces with the verb, as an inseparable particle, and so forms a compound. These particles are *dym*, *cym*, or *cy* and *ym*. The former is compounded of *dy*, signifying *iteration*, and *ym* denoting *mutual action;* the latter is the Latin *cum*. Hence the reciprocal power of these particles is secondary: e. g. *dymborthi*, to aid

mutually; *dymddadlu*, to dispute; *dymgaru*, to love one another; *dymgoddi*, to vex one another; *dymgredu*, to trust one another, or confide; *dymguraw*, to strike one another, or fight; *çyçwennys*, to desire mutually; *cydadnabod*, to know one anothes; *cydaddawiad*, to promise mutually; *cydrysllaw*, to pledge; *cydymadrawn*, to converse; *cydymdaith*, to accompany; *ymadroddi*, to discourse; *ymaddaw*, to promise; *ymavael*, to struggle; *ymdaeru*, to dispute, &c.

The form, which is at once current, full, and unequivocal, is the one that occurs in our own, and in the generality of languages. Herein there are two nouns (generally pronouns), and the construction is of the kind exhibited above — *ἀλλήλους*, *each other*, *einander*, *l'un l'autre*, &c.

Sometimes the two nouns remain separate, each preserving its independent form. This is the case in most of the languages derived from the Latin, in several of the Slavonic and Lithuanic dialects, and in (amongst others) the Old Norse, the Swedish, and the Danish, — l'un l'autre, French; uno otro, Span.; geden druheho, Bohemian; ieden drugiego, Polish; wiens wienâ, Lith.; weens ohtru, Lettish; hvert annan (masc.), hvert annat (neut.) Old Norse. See D. G. iii. 84.

Sometimes the two nouns coalesce, and form words to which it would be a mere refinement to deny the name of compounds: this is the case with the Greek — *ἀλλήλων*, *ἀλλήλοις*, *ἀλλήλους*.

Sometimes it is doubtful whether the phrase consist of a compound word or a pair of words. This occurs where, from the want of inflection, the form of the first word is the same in composition as it would have been out of it. Such is the case with our own language: *each-other*, *one-another*.

Throughout the mass of languages in general the details of the expression in question coincide; both subject and object are almost always expressed by pronouns, and these pronouns are much the same throughout. *One*, or some word equivalent, generally denotes the subject. *Other*, or some word equivalent, generally denotes the object, *e. g.* they struck *one another*. The varieties of expression may be collected from the following sketch: —

1. *a*. The subject is expressed by *one*, or some word equivalent, in most of the languages derived from the Latin, in several of the Slavonic dialects, in Lithuanic and Lettish, in Armenian, in German, in English, and doubtlessly in many other languages — *l'un* l'autre, Fr.; *uno* otro, Sp.; *ieden* drugiego, Polish; *wiens* wienâ, Lith.; *weens* ohtru, Lett.; *me* mæants, Armenian; *ein*ander, Germ.; *one* another, Engl.

b. By *each*, or some equivalent term, in English, Dutch,

and the Scandinavian languages — *each* other, English; *elk*-ander, Dutch; *hver*andre, Icelandic, Danish, Swedish.

c. By *this*, or some equivalent term, in Swedish and Danish (*hin*anden); in Lithuanic (*kitts* kittâ), and in Lettish (*zitts* zittu).

d. By *other*, or some equivalent term, in Greek and Armenian; ἀλλήλους, *ir*ærats.

e. By *man*, used in an indefinite sense and compounded with *lik* in Dutch, *malk*ander (mal-lik manlik).

f. By a term equivalent to *mate* or *fellow* in Laplandic — *gòim* gòimeme. — Rask, 'Lappisk Sproglære,' p. 102. Stockfleth, 'Grammatik,' p. 109.

2. *a.* In the expression of the object the current term is *other* or some equivalent word. Of this the use is even more constant than that of *one* expressive of the subject — l'un l'*autre*, French; uno *otro*, Spanish; ἀλλήλους, Greek; geden *druheho*, Bohemian; ieden *drugiego*, Polish; weens *ohtru*, Lettish; ir*ærats*, Armenian; ein*ander*, German; each *other*, one an*other*, English.

b. In Lithuanic the term in use is *one*; as, wiens *wienâ*. The same is the case for a second form in the Armenian mi*mæa*n.

c. In Laplandic it is denoted in the same as the subject; as gòim *gòimeme*.

Undoubtedly there are other varieties of this general method of expression. Upon those already exhibited a few remarks, however, may be made.

1. In respect to languages like the French, Spanish, &c., where the two nouns, instead of coalescing, remain separate, each retaining its inflection, it is clear that they possess a greater amount of perspicuity; inasmuch as (to say nothing of the distinction of gender) the subject can be used in the singular number when the mutual action of two persons (*i. e.* of *one* upon *another*) is spoken of, and in the plural when we signify that of more than two; e. g. *ils* (*i. e.* A and B) *se battaient — l'un l'autre:* but *ils* (A, B, C and D,) *se battaient — les uns les autres*. This degree of perspicuity might be attained in English and other allied languages by reducing to practice the difference between the words *each* and *one*; in which case we might say *A and B struck* one *another*, but *A, B and C struck* each *other*. In the Scandinavian languages this distinction is real; where *hin*anden is equivalent to *l'un l'autre*, French; *uno otro*, Spanish: whilst *hver*andre expresses *les uns les autres*, French; *unos otros*, Spanish. The same is the case in the Laplandic. — See Rask's Lappisk Sproglære, p. 102.

2. An analysis of such an expression as *they praise one another's* (or *each other's*) *conduct*, will show the lax character of certain forms in the Swedish. Of the two pronouns it is only the latter that appears in an oblique case, and this necessarily; hence the Swedish form *hvarsannars* is illogical. It is precisely what *one's another's* would be in English, or ἄλλων ἄλλων for ἀλλήλων in Greek. The same applies to the M. H. G. *einen anderen*. D. G. iii. 83.

3. The term expressive of the object appears in three forms, viz. preceded by the definite article (l'un *l'*autre), by the indefinite article (one *a*nother), and finally, standing alone (each other, einander). Of these three forms the first is best suited for expressing the reciprocal action of two persons (one out of two struck the other); whilst the second or third is fittest for signifying the reciprocal action of more than two (one out of many struck, and was struck by, some other).

The third general method of expressing mutual or reciprocal action is by the use of some particular form of the verb. In two, and probably more, of the African languages (the Woloff and Bechuana) this takes place. In the Turkish there is also a reciprocal form: as *sui-mek*, to love; *baki-mek*, to look; *sui-sh-mek*, to love one another; *baki-sh-mek*, to look at one another; *su-il-mek*, to be loved; *sui-sh-il-mek*, to be loved mutually. — *David's Turkish Grammar*.

The fourth form of expression gives the fact alluded to at the beginning of the paper: viz. an instrument of criticism in investigating the origin of certain deponent verbs. In all languages there is a certain number of verbs denoting actions, reciprocal or mutual to the agents. Such are the words *embrace*, *converse*, *strive against*, *wrestle*, *fight*, *rival*, *meet*, and several more. There are also other words where the existence of two parties is essential to the idea conveyed, and where the notion, if not that of reciprocal action, is akin to it; viz. *reproach*, *compromise*, *approach*, &c. Now in certain languages (the Latin and Greek) some of these verbs have a passive form; *i. e.* they are deponents, — *loquor*, *colloquor*, *luctor*, *reluctor*, *amplector*, *suavior*, *osculor*, *suspicor*, Latin: φιλοτιμέομαι, φιλοφρονέομαι, μάχομαι, διαλέγομαι, ἀλέομαι, διαλύομαι, ἀμείβομαι, &c., Greek. Hence arises the hypothesis, that it is to their reciprocal power on the one hand, and to the connexion between the passive, reflective and reciprocal forms on the other, that these verbs owe their deponent character. The fact essential to the probability of this hypothesis is the connexion between the reflective forms and the reciprocal ones.

Now for one branch of languages this can be shown most

satisfactorily. In Icelandic the middle voice is formed from the active by the addition of the reflective pronoun, *mik*, me, *sik*, him or self. Hence it is known by the terminations *mc* and *sc*, and by certain modifications of these affixes, viz. *st*, *s*, *z*, *mz*, *ms*. In the oldest stage of the language the reflective power of the middle voice, to the exclusion of a passive sense, is most constant: *e. g. hann var nafnadr* = he had the name given him; *hann nefnist* = he gave as his name, or named himself. It was only when the origin of the middle form became indistinct that its sense became either passive or deponent; as it generally is in the modern tongues of Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Now in the modern Scandinavian languages we have, on the one hand, certain deponent forms expressive of reciprocal action; whilst on the other we have, even in the very earliest stages of the Old Norse, middle or reflective forms used in a reciprocal sense. Of some of these, examples will be given: but the proof of their sense being reciprocal will not be equally conclusive in all. Some may perhaps be looked on as deponents (*ættust*, *beriast*, *skiliast*, *mödast*); whilst others may be explained away by the assumption of a passive construction (*fundoz* = they were found, not they found each other). Whatever may be the case with the words taken from the middle and modern stages of the language, this cannot be entertained in regard to the examples drawn from the oldest Norse composition, the Edda of Sæmund. For this reason the extracts from thence are marked *Edd. Sæm.*, and of these (and these alone) the writer has attempted to make the list exhaustive. The translations in Latin and Danish are those of the different editors.

1. Ættust, *fought each other.*

2. Beriaz, *strike each other.*

> brödur muno *beriaz.*
> fratres invicem pugnabunt.
>
> Voluspa, 41. Edd. Sæm.

This word is used in almost every page of the Sagas as a deponent signifying *to fight*: also in the Feroic dialect.

3. Bregþaz, *interchange.*

> orþom at *bregþaz.*
> verba commutare.
>
> Helga-Qviþa Hundlingsbana, i. 41. ii. 26. Edd. Sæm.

4. Drepiz, *kill one another.*

finnuz þeir báder daudir —— en ecki vapn höfþu þeir nema

bitlana af hestinum, ok þat hygia menn at þeir (Alrek and Eirek) hafi *drepiz* þar med. Sva segir Þiodolfr.; "*Drepaz* kvádu." — Heimskringla. Ynglinga-Saga, p. 23.

The brothers were found dead — and no weapons had they except the bits of their horses, and men think they (Alrek and Eirek) had *killed each other* therewith. So says Thiodolf.: "They said that they *killed each other*."

5. Um-faþmaz, *embrace each other*. See Atla-Quiþa hin Grænslenzko, 42. — *Edd. Sæm.*

6. Földes, *fell in with each other*. — Om morgonet effter *földes* wy in Kobenhaffn. — Norwegian Letters in 1531, A. D. See Samlingar til det Norske Folks Sprog og Historie, I. 2. 70. The morning after we *fell in with each other* in Copenhagen.

7. Funduz, *found each other, met*. See Vafþrudnis-mal 17. — Sigurd-Quiþ. i. 6. Edd. Sæm. — Færeyingar-Saga, p. 44. *Þeir funduz* is rendered *de fandt hverandre = they found each other*, in Haldorsen's Lexic. Island.

ef iþ Gymer *finniz*.
if you and Gymer meet. Harbards-l: 24. Edd. Sæm.

8. Gættuz, *consult each other*. See Voluspa, 6. 9. 21. 23. *Edd. Sæm.*

9. Glediaz, *rejoice each other*.

vapnom ok vádom
skulo vinir *glediaz*,
þæt er á sialfom sæmst:
vidr-géfendr ok endi gefendr
erost lengst vinir
ef þat biþr at verþa vel. Rigsmal. 41.

armis ac vestibus
amici *mutuo se delectent*,
queîs in ipso (datore) forent conspicua:
pretium renumerantes et remunerantes
inter se diutissime sunt amici
si negotium feliciter se dat.

The middle form and reciprocal sense of *erost* is remarkable in this passage.

10. Hauggvaz, *hack each other, fight*.

allir Einheriar
Oþins túnom i
hauggvaz hverian dag.

all the Einheriar
in Odin's towns
hack each other every day. Vafþrudnis-Mal. 41. Edd. Sæm.
ef þeir *högvaz* orþom á.
si se maledictis invicem insectentur. Sig-Qviö. ii. 1. Edd. Sæm.

11. Hættaz, *cease.*

hættomc hættingi.
cessemus utrinque a minaciis. Harbardslióð, 51. Edd. Sæm.

Such is the translation of the editors, although the reciprocal power is not unequivocal.

12. Hittaz, *hit upon each other*, *meet.* Hittoz, Voluspa, 7. Hittomk, Hadding-skata, 22. Hittaz, Solar-l: 82. Edd. Sæm. Hittust, Ol. Trygv. Sag. p. 90. Hittuz oc beriaz, Heimskringla, Saga Halfd. Svart. p. 4. Hittuz, Yngl. Sag. p. 42. *alibi passim* þeir *hittu* is rendered, in Bjorn Haldorsen's Islandic Lexicon, *de traf hinanden*, *they hit upon each other.*

13. Kiempis, *fight each other.*

gaar udi gaarden oc *kiempis*, oc nelegger hver hinanden, goes out in the house and *fight each the other*, and each knocks down the other.

Such is the translation by Resenius, in modern Danish, of the following extract from Snorro's *Edda*, p. 34. — Ganga ut i gardinn og *beriast*, og fellar huor annar. Here the construction is not, *they fell* (or knock down) *each the other*, but *each fells the other*; since *fellar* and *nelegger* are singular forms.

14. Mælast, *talk to each other*, *converse.* Talast, *ditto.*

Mæliz þu. Vafþrudnismal, 9.

melomc i sessi saman = colloquamur sedentes. ib. 19. Edd. Sæm.

mælast þeir *vid*, ádr þeir *skiliast*, at þeir mundi þar *finnast* þa. — Fóstbrædra-Saga, p. 7.

they *said to each other* before they *parted from each other* that they should *meet each other* there.

Yngvi ok Bera satu ok *töluduz* vidr. — Heimskr. Yngl. S. p. 24.

Griss mælti; hverír ero þessir menn er sva *tulast vid* bliðliga? Avàldi svarar; þa er Hallfreydr Ottarson ok Kolfinna dóthir min. Ol. Trygyv. Saga, p. 152. Griss said, who are these persons who *talk together* so blithely? Avaldi answers, they are Halfrid Ottarson and Kolfinna my daughter. *Talast* is similarly used in Feroic. *Kvödust*, bespoke each other, occurs in the same sense — þat var einn dag at Brand ok Finbogi *fundust* ok *kvödust* blídliga. — Vatnsdæla-Sag. p. 16.

15. Mettæst, *meet each other*, *meet.*

Kungen aff Ffranchriche, kungen aff England, oc kungen aff Schottland skule *motes* til Chalis. — Letter from Bergen in 1531, from Samlinger til det Norske Folks Sprog og Historie, i. 2. p. 53. The king of France, the king of England, and the king of Scotland should *meet each other* at Calais.

Throughout the Danish, Swedish and Feroic, this verb is used as a deponent.

16. Rekaz, *vex each other.*

gumnar margir
erosc gagn-hollir,
enn at virþi *rekaz.* Rigsmal. 32. Edd. Sæm.

multi homines
sunt inter se admodum benevoli,
sed tamen *mutuo se* (vel) in convivio *exagitant.*

17. Sakaz, *accuse each other, recriminate.*

at vit mynim siafrum *sacaz*,
ut nos ipsi mutuo insectemur. Hamdis-Mal. 28.

ef viþ einir scolom
sáryrþom *sacaz.*
si nobis duobus usu veniat
amarulentis dicteriis invicem
nos lacessere. Ægis-drecka, 5.

sculoþ inni her
sáryrþom *sacaz.* Ibid. 19. Edd. Sæm.

18. Saz, *looked at each other.*

saz i augv
fadir ok módir. Rigsmal. 24.

they looked at each other in the eyes,
father and mother.

19. Sættaz, *settle between each other, reconcile.* — Atla-Mal. 45. Edd. Sæm.

Komu vinir þveggia þvi vid, at þeir *sættuz*, ok lögdu konungar stefnu med *sér*, ok *hittuz* ok gérdo frit mellum sin. — Heimsk. Yngling-S. 42.

There came friends of both in order that they should be *reconciled*, and the kings sent messages between them, and *met* and made peace between them. — Also Vatnsd. S. p. 16.

20. Seljas, *to give to each other.*

seldz eiþa. Sig. Qv. iii. 1. Edd. Sæm.

juramenta dederunt inter se.

21. Señdaz, *send, or let pass between each other.*

sato samty´nis,
senduz fár-hugi,
henduz heipt-yrþi
hvarki *sér* undi. Atla-Mal. 85.

They sat in the same town (dwelling),
They *sent between each other* danger-thoughts,
They *fetched between each other* hate-words,
Not *either way* did they love *each other*.

Here, over and above the use of *senduz* and *henduz*, *ser* is equivalent to *hinanden*.

22. Skiliaz, *part from each other.*

Skiliumz Solar-Lioð. 82.
Skiliaz. Sigurd-Qviþ. i. 24.
Skiliomc. Ibid. 53. Edd. Sæm.
Vit *sjiljiast, we two part* —

Occurs in the poem Brinilda (st. 109) in the Feroic dialect. In Danish and Swedish the word is deponent.

23. Skiptust, *interchange.*

Þeir *skiptust* mörgum giöfum *vid* um vetrinn — Vatns-dæla-S. 10.

they *made interchanges with each other* with many gifts for the winter.

Also in the Feroic.

24. Strujast, *strike one another, fight.* Feroic.

og *mötast* tair, og *strujast* avlaji lanji. — Fareying-Sag. 18. Feroic text.

ok *mætast* þeir, ok berjast mjök leingi. — Icelandish text.

de *mödtes* og strede meget længe imod hinanden. — Danish text.

they *met* and *fought* long against *each other.*

at e vilde vid *gjordust* stálbröir, og *strujast* ikkji longur. — Feroic text, p. 21.

at við *gerðimst* fèlagar, en *berjumst* eigi leingr. — Icelandic text.

at vi skulle blive Stalbröde og ikke *slaaes* længer — Danish text.

that we should become comrades and not *fight* longer.

The active form occurs in the same dialect:

tajr struija nú langji. 18.

25. Truasc, *trust each other.*

vel mættern þæir *truazc.* För Skirnis. Edd. Sæm.

26. Unnaz. *See* Veittaz.

27. Vegiz, *attack* each *other*.

vilcat ec at iþ reiþir *vegiz*. Ægisdrecka 18. Edd. Sæm.

I will not that ye two angry *attack each other*.

28. Veittaz, *contract mutually*.

þav Helgi ok Svava *veittuz* varar, ok *unnoz* forþo mikit = Helgius et Svava pactum sponsalitium *inter se contraxerunt*, et *alter alterum* mirifice *amarunt*. — Haddingia-Sk. between 29 and 30.

29. Verpaz, *throw between each other*.

urpuz á orþom. Atl.-M. 39. Edd. Sæm.

verba inter se jaciebant.

Such is a portion of the examples that prove the reciprocal power of the reflective or middle verb in the language of Scandinavia; and that, during all its stages and in each of its derived dialects. It cannot be doubted that to this circumstance certain verbs in Danish and Swedish owe their deponent form: viz. *vi slåss*, we fight (strike one another); *vi brottas*, we wrestle; *vi omgass*, we have intercourse with; *vi mötas*, we meet, Swedish; *vi slaaes*, we fight; *vi skilles*, we part; *vi mödes*, we meet, Danish. In the latest Swedish grammar, by C. L. Daae, this reciprocal (vekselvirkende) power is recognized and exhibited. See Udsigt over det Svenske Sprogs Grammatik. Christiana, 1837. The same is the Molbech's Danske Ordbog in vv. *skilles*, *slaaes*, *mödes*.

Next to the Norse languages the French affords the best instances of the reciprocal power of the reflective verb; as *se battre*, *s'aimer*, *s'entendre*, *se quéreller*, *se reconcilier*, *se disputer*, and other words of less frequent occurrence.

Ces enfans *s'aimaient*, *s'adoraient*, se sont jetés à mes pieds en pleurant. — Les Inséparables, A. 1. S. 1.

Les Républics Italiens acharnés à *se détruire*. — Pardessus II. 65.

This has been recognized by an old grammarian, Restaut, who insists upon the use of the adverb *entre*, in order to avoid the ambiguity of such phrases as "vous *vous* dites des injures;" "nous *nous* écrivons souvent;" "Pierre et Antoine *se* louent à tout moment."

By a writer in the Museum Criticum the reciprocal power of the Greek middle has been indicated. For the classical languages the question has not met with the proper investigation. Passages where the sense is at least as reciprocal as in the line

Χεῖρας τ' ἀλλήλων λαβέτην καὶ πιστώσαντο. — Il. vi. 233,

must be numerous.

In the Dutch language the use of *zich* for *elkander* is a peculiarity of the Guelderland and Overyssel dialects; as "zij hebt *zich* eslagen," for "zij hebben *elkander* geslagen." See Opmerkingen omtrent den Gelderschen Tongval, in Taalkundig Magazijn ii. 14. p. 403.

Of the use of *ser* for *hinanden* or *hverandre*, when uncombined with the verb, we have, amongst other, the following example in the Icelandic version of the Paradise Lost: —

Ef frá tilsyndar-
punkti hleyptu *ser*
planetur fram,
ok *mættust* miklum gny
ó midjum himni. B. 6.

Similar to this are the phrases *vi se os igjen*, wee see us (each other) again, in Danish, and *wir sehen uns wieder*, in German. Examples from the M. H. G. are given in the D. G. iv. The Turkish sign of the reciprocal verb is identical with the demonstrative pronoun, *i. e.* ش. This may possibly indicate a connection between the two forms.

Other points upon the subject in hand may be collected from the Deutsche Grammatik, iii. 13. 82; iv. 454. Here the adverbial character of the M. H. G. *einander* for *einandern*, the omission of *ein*, as in *anander* for *an einander*, and the omission (real or supposed) of *ander* in "*wider ein* = *wider einander*," are measures of the laxity of language caused by the peculiarity of the combination in question. At present it is sufficient to repeat the statement, that for one group of languages at least there is satisfactory proof of certain deponents having originally been reciprocal, and of certain reciprocal expressions having originally been reflective.

ON THE CONNEXION BETWEEN THE IDEAS OF ASSOCIATION AND PLURALITY AS AN INFLUENCE IN THE EVOLUTION OF INFLECTION.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

MARCH 9, 1849.

It is well-known that by referring to that part of the Deutsche Grammatik which explains those participial forms which (like *y-cleped* in English, and like *ge-sprochen* and the participles in general in German) begin with *ge* or *y*, the following doctrines respecting this same prefix may be collected: —

1. That it has certainly grown out of the fuller forms *ka* or *ga*.

2. That it has, probably, grown out of a still fuller form *kam* or *gam*.

3. That this fuller form is the Gothic equivalent of the Latin *cum* = *with*.

Such are the views respecting the *form* of the word in question. Respecting its *meaning*, the following points seem to be made out: —

1. That when prefixed to nouns (as is, not rarely, the case), it carries with it the idea of *association* or *collection*: — M. G. *sinþs* = *a journey*, *ga-sinþa* = *a companion*; O. M. G. *perc* = *hill*; *ki-pirki* = (*ge-birge*) *a range of hills*.

2. That it has also a *frequentative* power. Things which recur frequently recur with a tendency to collection or association: — M. H. G. *ge-rassel* = *rustling*; *ge-rumpel* = *crumpling*.

3. That it has also the power of expressing the possession of a quality: —

A.-S.	Eng.	A.S.	Latin.
feax	*hair*,	*ge*-feax	*comatus.*
heorte	*heart*,	*ge*-heort	*cordatus.*

This is because every object is associated with the object that possesses it — *a sea with waves = a wavy sea.*

The present writer has little doubt that the Tumali grammar of Dr. Tutshek supplies a similar (and at the same time a very intelligible) application of a particle equivalent to the Latin *cum.*

He believes that the Tumali word = *with* is what would commonly be called the sign of the plural number of the personal pronouns; just as *me-cum* and *te-cum* would become equivalents to *nos* and *vos*, if the first syllables were nominative instead of oblique, and if the preposition denoted indefinite conjunction. In such a case

mecum would mean *I conjointly = we*,
tecum would mean *thou conjointly = ye.*

Such is the illustration of the possible power of a possible combination. The reasons for thinking it to have a reality in one language at least lie in the following forms: —

1. The Tumali word for *with* is *da.*

2. The Tumali words for *I*, *thou*, and *he* respectively are *ngi*, *ngo*, *ngu.*

3. The Tumali words for *we*, *ye*, *they* are *ngin-de*, *ngon-da*, *ngen-da* respectively.

4. The Tumali substantives have no such plural. With them it is formed on a totally different principle.

5. The Tumali adjectives have no plural at all.

6. The Tumali numerals (even those which express more than unity and are, therefore, *naturally* plural) *have* a plural. When, however, it occurs, it is formed on the same principle as that of the plurals of the substantive.

7. The word *da = with* is, in Tumali, of a more varied application than any other particle; and that both as a *pre*-position and a *post*-position: — *daura = soon* (*da = in*, *aura = neighbourhood*); *datom = in* (*with*) *front* (*face*); *d-ondul = roundabout* (*ondul = circle*); *dale = near* (*le = side*), &c.

8. Prepositions, which there is every reason to believe are already compounded with *da*, allow even a second *da*, to precede the word which they govern: — *daber deling = over the earth* (*ber = earth*).

9. The ideas *with me*, *with thee*, *with him*, are expressed by *ngi-dan*, *ngo-dan*, and *ngu-dan* respectively; but the ideas of *with us*, *with you*, *with them* are *not* expressed by *nginde-dan*, *ngonda-dan*, *ngenda-dan;* but by peculiar words — *tinem = with us; toman = with you; tenan = with them.*

On the other hand, the following fact is, as far as it goes, against this view, a fact upon which others may lay more stress than the present writer. "*Da* admits of a very varied application. Respecting its form the following should be observed: (*a.*) That *a* may be elided when it happens to stand as a preposition before words which begin with a vowel: for instance, *ardgen*, 'the valley'; *dardgen*, 'in the valley'; *ondul*, 'the circle'; *dondul*, 'round about in the circle'. (*b.*) It changes its *a* into *è*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, according to the vowel of the syllable before which the *da* is placed, or even without any regard to it. Instances of this are found in *dìring*, *dorong*, &c.; further instances are, *doromko*, 'into the hut' (*rom*); *dètum* or *dotum*, 'in the grave.' (*c.*) As a postposition it appends an *n: adgdan*, 'on the head'; *aneredan*, 'on the day.'" Taking the third of these rules literally, the plural pronouns should end in *dan* rather than in *da* and *de*.

It is considered that over and above the light that this particular formation (if real) may throw upon the various methods by which an inflection like that of the plural number may be evolved, and more especially upon the important but neglected phænomena of the so-called *inclusive* and *exclusive* plurals, many other points of general grammar may be illustrated.

ON THE WORD *CUJUM*.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

MARCH 9, 1849.

The writer wishes to make the word *cujum*, as found in a well-known quotation from the third eclogue of Virgil, —

Dic mihi Damæta *cujum* pecus?

the basis of some remarks which are meant to be suggestions rather than doctrines.

In the second edition of a work upon the English language, he devoted an additional chapter to the consideration of the grammatical position of the words *mine* and *thine*, respecting which he then considered (and still considers) himself correct in assuming that the current doctrine concerning them was, that they were, in origin, genitive or possessive cases, and that they were adjectives only in a secondary sense. Now whatever was then written upon this subject was written with the view of recording an opinion in favour of exactly the opposite doctrine, viz. that they were originally adjectives, but that afterwards they took the appearance of oblique cases. Hence for words like *mine* and *thine* there are two views: —

1. That they were originally *cases*, and *adjectives* only in a secondary manner.

2. That they were originally *adjectives*, and *cases* only in a secondary manner.

In which predicament is the word *cujum?* If in the first, it supplies a remarkable instance of an unequivocally adjectival form, as tested by an inflection in the way of gender, having grown out of a case. If in the second, it shows how truly the converse may take place, since it cannot be doubted that whatever in this respect can be predicated of *cujus* can be predicated of *ejus* and *hujus* as well.

Assuming this last position, it follows that if *cujus* be originally a case, we have a proof how thoroughly it may *take* a gender; whereas if it be originally an adjective, *ejus*

and *hujus* (for by a previous assumption they are in the same category) are samples of the extent to which words like it may *lose* one.

Now the termination *-us* is the termination of an adjective, and is *not* the termination of a genitive case; a fact that fixes the *onus probandi* with those who insist upon the genitival character of the words in question. But as it is not likely that every one lays so much value upon this argument as is laid by the present writer, it is necessary to refer to two facts taken from the Greek: —

1. That the class of words itself is not a class which (as is often the case) naturally leads us to expect a variation from the usual inflections. The forms οὗ, οἷ, ἕ, and ὅς, οὗ, ὦ, are perfectly usual.

2. That the adjectives ὅς = ἑός,* κοῖος = ποῖος, and οἷος, are not only real forms, but forms of a common kind. Hence, if we consider the termination *-jus* as a case-ending, we have a phænomenon in Latin for which we miss a Greek equivalent; whilst on the other hand, if we do not consider it as adjectival, we have the Greek forms οἷος, κοῖος = ποῖος and ὅς = ἑός, without any Latin ones. I do not say that this argument is, when taken alone, of any great weight. In doubtful cases, however, it is of value. In the present case it enables us to get rid of an inexplicable genitival form, at the expense of a slight deflection from the usual power of an adjective. And here it should be remembered that many of the arguments in favour a case becoming an adjective are (to a certain extent) in favour of an adjective becoming a case — *to a certain extent* and *to a certain extent* only, because a change in one direction by no means necessarily implies a change in the reverse one, although it is something in favour of its probability.

Probably *unius, ullius, illius*, and *alterius*, are equally, as respects their origin, adjectival forms with *ejus, cujus*, and *hujus*.

Now it must not be concealed that one of the arguments which apply to words like *mine* and *thine* being adjectives rather than genitives, does not apply to words like *ejus, cujus*, and *hujus*. The reason is as follows; and it is exhibited in nearly the same words which have been used in the work already mentioned. — The idea of partition is one of the ideas expressed by the genitive case. The necessity for expressing this idea is an element in the necessity for evolving a genitive case. With personal pronouns of the singular number the idea of partition is of less frequent occurrence than

* hora for wora, κοῖος = *cujus*; ὅιος = *hujus*; ἑος = *ejus* (1859).

with most other words, since a personal pronoun of the *singular* number is the name of a unity, and, as such, the name of an object far less likely to be separated into parts than the name of a collection. Phrases like *some of them*, *one of you*, *many of us*, *any of them*, *few of us*, &c., have no analogues in the singular number, such as *one of me*, *a few of thee*, &c. The partitive words that can combine with singular pronouns are comparatively few, viz. *half*, *quarter*, *part*, &c.; and they can all combine equally with plurals — *half of us*, *a quarter of them*, *a portion of us*. The partition of a singular object with a pronominal name is of rare occurrence in language. This last statement proves something more than appears at first sight. It proves that no argument in favour of the so-called *singular* genitives, like *mine* and *thine*, can be drawn from the admission (if made) of the existence of the true plural genitives *ou-r*, *you-r*, *the-ir*. The two ideas are not in the same predicament.

Again, the convenience of expressing the difference between *suus* and *ejus*, is, to a certain extent, a reason for the evolution of a genitive case to words like *is;* but it is a reason to a certain extent only, and that extent a small one, since an equally convenient method of expressing the difference is to be found in the fact of there being two roots for the pronouns in question, the root from which we get *ea*, *id*, *eum*, *ejus*, &c., and the root from which we get *sui*, *sibi*, *suus*, &c.

Here the paper should end, for here ends the particular suggestion supplied by the word in question. Two questions however present themselves too forcibly to be wholly passed over: —

I. The great extent to which those who look in Latin for the same inflections that occur in Greek, must look for them under new names. That two tenses in Greek (the aorist like *ἔ-τυπ-σα*, and the perfect like *τέ-τυφ-α*) must be looked for in the so-called *double* form of a *single* tense in Latin (*vic-si*, *mo-mordi*) is one of the oldest facts of this sort. That the Greek participle in *-μενος* (*τυπτόμενος*) must be sought for in the passive persons in *-mini* is a newer notice.

II. The fact that the character of the deflection that takes place between case and adjective is not *single* but *double*. It goes both ways. The change from case to adjective is one process in philology; the change from adjective to case another; and both should be recognized. This is mentioned for the sake of stating, that except in a few details, there is nothing in the present remarks that is meant to be at variance with the facts and arguments of five papers already laid before this Society, viz. those of Mr. Garnett on the

Formation of Words from Inflected Cases, and on the Analysis of the Verb.

The papers alluded to really deal with two series of facts: — (A.) *Deflection with identity of form.* — In this the inflection is still considered an inflection, but is dealt with as one different from what it really is, *i. e.* as a nominative instead of an oblique one. Some years back the structure of the Finlandic suggested to the present writer: —

1. A series of changes in meaning whereby such a term as *with waves* might equal *wavy*.

2. The existence of a class of words of which *sestertium* was the type, where an oblique case, *with a convertible termination*, becomes a nominative.

3. The possible evolution of forms like *fluctuba*, *fluctubum* = *fluctuosa*, *fluctuosum*, from forms like *fluctubus*.

Mr. Garnett has multiplied cases of this kind; his illustrations from the Basque being pre-eminently typical, *i. e.* like the form *sestertium*. If the modern vehicle called an *omnibus* had been invented in ancient Rome, if it had had the same name as it has now, and if its plural form had been *omnibi*, it would also have been a typical instance.

Words of the hypothetical form *fluctuba*, *fluctubum*, have not been discovered. They would have existed if the word just quoted had been (if used in ancient Rome at all) used as an adjective, *omnibus currus*, *omniba esseda*, *omnibum plaustrum*.

(B.) *Deflection with superaddition.* — Here the inflection is dealt with as if it were not inflectional but radical. This is the case with ἴφιος. Words like *it-*, as proved by the genitive *i-t-s*, and the so-called *petrified* (*versteinerte*) nominative cases of the German grammarians, are of this class.

ON THE AORISTS IN -KA.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

MARCH 11, 1853.

A well-known rule in the Eton Greek Grammar may serve to introduce the subject of the present remarks: — "Quinque sunt aoristi primi qui futuri primi characteristicam non assumunt: *ἔθηκα posui*, *ἔδωκα dedi*, *ἧκα misi*, *εἶπα dixi*, *ἤνεγκα tuli*." The absolute accuracy of this sentence is no part of our considerations: it has merely been quoted for the sake of illustration.

What is the import of this abnormal *κ*? or, changing the expression, what is the explanation of the aorist in *-κα*? Is it certain that it *is* an aorist? or, granting this, is it certain that its relations to the future are exceptional?

The present writer was at one time inclined to the doubts implied by the first of these alternatives, and gave some reasons* for making the form a *perfect* rather than an aorist. He finds, however, that this is only shifting the difficulty. How do *perfects* come to end in *-κα*? The typical and unequivocal perfects are formed by a reduplication at the beginning, and a modification of the final radical consonant at the end of words, *τύπ(τ)ω*, *τέ-τυφ-α*; and this is the origin of the *χ* in *λέλεχα*, &c., which represents the *γ* of the root. Hence, even if we allow ourselves to put the *κ* in *ἔθηκα* in the same category with the *κ* in *ὀμώμοκα*, &c., we are as far as ever from the true origin of the form.

In this same category, however, the two words — and the classes they represent — *can* be placed, notwithstanding some small difficulties of detail. At any rate, it is easier to refer *ὀμώμοκα* and *ἔθηκα* to the same tense than it is to do so with *ὀμώμοκα* and *τέτυφα*.

The next step is to be sought in Bopp's Comparative

* English Language, p. 489.

Grammar. Here we find the following extract: — "The old Slavonic *dakh* 'I gave,' and analogous formations remind us, through their guttural, which *takes the place of a sibilant*, of the Greek aorists ἔθηκα, ἔδωκα, ἧκα. That which in the old Slavonic has become a rule in the first person of the three numbers, viz. the *gutturalization of an original s*, may have occasionally taken place in the Greek, but carried throughout all numbers. No conjecture lies closer at hand than that of regarding ἔδωκα *as a corruption of* ἔδωσα," &c. ..... "The Lithuanian also presents a form which is akin to the Greek and Sanscrit aorist, in which, as it appears to me, *k assumes the place of an original s*." (vol. ii. p. 791, Eastwick's and Wilson's translation.) The italics indicate the words that most demand attention.

The old Slavonic inflection alluded to is as follows: —

	SINGULAR.	DUAL.	PLURAL.
1.	Nes-*och*.....	Nes-*ochowa*.....	Nes-*ochom*.
2.	Nes-*e*	Nes-*osta*.....	Nes-*oste*.
3.	Nes-*e*	Nes-*osta*.....	Nes-*osza*.

Now it is clear that the doctrine to which these extracts commit the author is that of the secondary or derivative character of the form of κ and the primary or fundamental character of the forms in σ. The former is deduced from the latter. And this is the doctrine which the present writer would reverse. He would just reverse it, agreeing with the distinguished scholar whom he quotes in the identification of the Greek form with the Slavonic. So much more common is the change from *k*, *g* and the allied sounds, to *s*, *z*, &c., than that from *s*, *z*, &c. to *k*, *g*, that the *à priori* probabilities are strongly against Bopp's view. Again, the languages that preeminently encourage the change are the Slavonic; yet it is just in these languages that the form in *k* is assumed to be secondary. For *s* to become *h*, and for *h* to become *k* (or *g*), is no improbable change: still, as compared with the transition from *k* to *s*, it is exceedingly rare.

As few writers are better aware of the phænomena connected with the direction of letter-changes than the philologist before us, it may be worth while to ask, why he has ignored them in the present instances. He has probably done so because the Sanscrit forms were in *s;* the habit of considering whatever is the more Sanscrit of two forms to be the older being well-nigh universal. Nevertheless, the difference between a language which is old because it is represented by old samples of its literature, and a language which is old because it contains primary forms, is manifest

upon a very little reflection. The positive argument, however, in favour of the *k* being the older form, lies in the well-known phænomenon connected with the vowels *e* and *i*, as opposed to *a*, *o*, and *u*. All the world over, *e* and *i* have a tendency to convert a *k* or *g*, when it precedes them, into *s*, *z*, *sh*, *zh*, *ksh*, *gzh*, *tsh*, and *dzh*, or some similar sibilant. Hence, as often as a sign of tense consisting of *k*, is followed by a sign of person beginning with *e* or *i*, an *s* has chance of being evolved. In this case such a form as ἐφίλησα, ἐφίλησας, ἐφίλησε, may have originally run ἐφίληκα, ἐφίληκας, ἐφίληκε. The modified form in σ afterwards extends itself to the other persons and numbers. Such is the illustration of the hypothesis. An objection against it lies in the fact of the person which ends in a small vowel, being only one out of seven. On the other hand, however the third person singular is used more than all the others put together. With this influence of the small vowel other causes may have cooperated. Thus, when the root ended in κ or γ, the combination κ *radical*, and κ *inflexional* would be awkward. It would give us such words as ἔλεκ-κα, &c.; words like τέτυπ-κα, ἔγραπ-κα, being but little better, at least in a language like the Greek.

The suggestions that now follow lead into a wide field of inquiry; and they may be considered, either on their merits as part of a separate question, or as part of the proof of the present doctrine. In this latter respect they are not altogether essential, *i. e.* they are more confirmatory if admitted than derogatory if denied. What if the future be derived from the aorist, instead of the aorist from the future? In this case we should increase what may be called our *dynamics*, by increasing the points of contact between a *k* and a small vowel; this being the influence that determines the evolution of an *s*. All the persons of the future, except the first, have ε for one (at least) of these vowels —

τύψ-σ-ω, τύψ-σ-εις, τύψ-σ-ει, τύψ-ε-τον, &c.

The moods are equally efficient in the supply of small vowels.

The doctrine, then, now stands that *k* is the older form, but that, through the influence of third persons singular, future forms, and conjunctive forms, so many *s*-es became developed, as to supersede it except in a few instances. The Latin language favours this view. There, the old future like *cap-s-o*, and the preterites like *vixi* (*vic-si*) exhibit a small vowel in *all* their persons, *e. g. vic-s-i*, *vic-s-isti*, *vic-s-it*, &c. Still the doctrine respecting this influence of the small vowel in the way of the developement of sibilants out of gutturals is defective until we find a real instance of the change as-

sumed. As if, for the very purpose of illustrating the occasional value of obscure dialects, the interesting language of the Serbs of Lusatia and Cotbus supplies one. Here the form of the preterite is as follows; the Serb of Illyria and the Lithuanic being placed in juxtaposition and contrast with the Serb of Lusatia. Where a small vowel follows the characteristic of the tense the sound is that of *sz*; in other cases it is that of *ch* (*kh*)

	LUSATIAN.	ILLYRIAN.	LITHUANIC.	LETTISH.
Sing. 1.	nosz*ach* . .	*do*neso, donije	nesziau. .	nessu.
2.	nosz*esze* . .	*do*nese, donije	neszieі . .	nessi.
3.	nosz*esze* . .	*do*nese, donije	neszieі . .	nesse.
Dual 1.	nosz*achwe*	. . . . .	neszіewa.	. . . . .
2.	nosz*estaj* .	. . . . .	neszieta.	. . . . .
3.	nosz*estaj* .	. . . . .	neszie.	. . . . .
Plur. 1.	nosz*achmy*	*do*nesosmo, donijesmo	neszieme.	nessam.
2.	nosz*eśće* .	*do*nesoste, donijeste .	neszіete .	nessat.
3.	nosz*achu* .	*do*nesosze, donijesze .	neszie. . .	nesse.

IV.

METRICA.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE CAESURA IN THE GREEK SENARIUS.

FROM THE

TRANSACTIONS OF THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

JUNE 23, 1843.

In respect to the cæsura of the Greek tragic senarius, the rules, as laid down by Porson in the Supplement to his Preface to the Hecuba, and as recognised, more or less, by the English school of critics, seem capable of a more general expression, and, at the same time, liable to certain limitations in regard to fact. This becomes apparent when we investigate the principle that serves as the foundation to these rules; in other words, when we exhibit the *rationale*, or doctrine, of the cæsura in question. At this we can arrive by taking cognizance of a second element of metre beyond that of quantity.

It is assumed that the element in metre which goes, in works of different writers, under the name of ictus metricus, or of arsis, is the same as accent *in the sense of that word in English*. It is this that constitutes the difference between words like *tyrant* and *resúme*, or *súrvey* and *survéy;* or (to take more convenient examples) between the word *Aúgust*, used as the name of a month, and *augúst* used as an adjective. Without inquiring how far this coincides with the accent and accentuation of the classical grammarians, it may be stated that, in the forthcoming pages, arsis, ictus metricus, and accent (*in the English sense of the word*), mean one and the same thing. With this view of the arsis, or ictus, we may ask how far, in each particular foot of the senarius, it coincides with the quantity.

First Foot. — In the first place of a tragic senarius it is a matter of indifference whether the arsis fall on the first or second syllable, that is, it is a matter of indifference whether the foot be sounded as *tỳrant* or as *resúme*, as *Aúgust* or as *augúst*. In the following lines the words ἥκω, παλαι, εἴπερ, τινας, may be pronounced either as ἧκω, πάλαι, εἴπερ, τίνας, or as ἡκώ, παλαί, ειπερ', τινάς, without any detriment to the character of the line wherein they occur.

Ἥκω νεκρων κευθμωνα και σκοτου πυλας.
Πάλαι κυνηγετουντα και μετρουμενον.
Εἴπερ δικαιος εστ' εμος τα πατροθεν.
Τίνας ποθ' ἕδρας τασδε μοι θοαζετε.

or,

Ἡκώ νεκρων κευθμωνα και σκοτου πυλας.
Παλαί κυνηγετουντα και μετρουμενον.
Ειπερ' δικαιος εσθ' εμος τα πατροθεν.
Τινάς ποθ' ἕδρας τασδε μοι θοαζετε.

Second Foot. — In the second place, it is also matter of indifference whether the foot be sounded as *Aúgust* or as *augúst*. In the first of the four lines quoted above we may say either *νέκρων* or *νεκρών*, without violating rhythm of the verse.

Third Foot. — In this part of the senarius it is no longer a matter of indifference whether the foot be sounded as *Aúgust* or as *augúst*; that is, it is no longer a matter of indifference whether the arsis and the quantity coincide. In the circumstance that the last syllable of the third foot *must* be accented (in the English sense of the word), taken along with a second fact, soon about to be exhibited, lies the doctrine of the penthimimer and hephthimimer cæsuras.

The proof of the coincidence between the arsis and the quantity in the third foot is derived partly from *à posteriori*, partly from *à priori* evidence.

1. In the Supplices of Æschylus, the Persæ, and the Bacchæ, three dramas where licences in regard to metre are pre-eminently common, the number of lines wherein the sixth syllable (*i. e.* the last half of the third foot) is without an arsis, is at the highest sixteen, at the lowest five; whilst in the remainder of the extant dramas the proportion is undoubtedly smaller.

2. In all lines where the sixth syllable is destitute of ictus, the iambic character is violated: as —

Θρηκην περαράντες μογις πολλῳ πονῳ.
Δυοιν γεροντοίν δε στρατηγειται φυγη.

These are facts which may be verified either by referring to the tragedians, or by constructing senarii like the lines last quoted. The only difficulty that occurs arises in determining, in a dead language like the Greek, the absence or presence of the arsis. In this matter the writer has satisfied himself of the truth of the two following propositions: — 1. That the accentuation of the grammarians denotes some modification of pronunciation other than that which constitutes the difference between *Áugust* and *augúst*; since, if it were not so, the word ἄγγελον would be sounded like *mérrily*, and the word ἀγγέλων like *disáble;* which is improbable. 2. That the arsis lies upon radical rather than inflectional syllables, and out of two inflectional syllables upon the first rather than the second; as βλέπ-ω, βλεψ-άσ-α, not βλεπ-ώ, βλεψ-ασ-ά. The evidence upon these points is derived from the structure of language in general. The *onus probandi* lies with the author who presumes an arsis (accent in the English sense) on a *non*-radical syllable.

Doubts, however, as to the pronunciation of certain words, leave the precise number of lines violating the rule given above undetermined. It is considered sufficient to show that, wherever they occur, the iambic character is violated.

The circumstance, however, of the last half of the third foot requiring an arsis, brings us only half way towards the doctrine of the cæsura. With this must be combined a second fact arising out of the constitution of the Greek language in respect to its accent. In accordance with the views just exhibited, the author conceives that no Greek word has an arsis upon the last syllable, except in the three following cases: —

1. Monosyllables, not enclitic; as σφών, πάς, χθών, δμώς, νώ, νύν, &c.

2. Circumflex futures; as νεμώ, τεμώ, &c.

3. Words abbreviated by apocope; in which case the penultimate is converted into a final syllable; δώμ', φειδεσθ' κεντείτ', εγώγ', &c.

Now the fact of a syllable with an arsis being, in Greek, rarely final, taken along with that of the sixth syllable requiring an arsis, gives, as a matter of necessity, the circumstance that, in the Greek drama, the sixth syllable shall occur anywhere rather than at the end of a word; and this is only another way of saying, that, in a tragic senarius, the syllable in question shall generally be followed by other syllables in the same word. All this the author considers as so truly a matter of necessity, that the objection to his view of the Greek cæsura must lie either against his idea of the

nature of the accents, or nowhere; since, that being admitted, the rest follows of course.

As the sixth syllable must not be final, it must be followed in the same word by one syllable, or by more than one.

1. *The sixth syllable followed by one syllable in the same word.* — This is only another name for the seventh syllable occurring at the end of a word, and it gives at once the hephthimimer cæsura: as —

Ἥκω νεκρων κευθμώνα και σκοτου πυλας.
Ἱκτηριοις κλαδοίσιν εξεστεμμενοι.
Ὁμου τε παιανών τε και στεναγματων.

2. *The sixth syllable followed by two (or more) syllables in the same word.* — This is only another name for the eighth (or some syllable after the eighth) syllable occurring at the end of a word; as —

Οδμη βροτειων αἵματων με προσγελα.
Λαμπρους δυναστας εμ' πρεποντας αιθερι.

Now this arrangement of syllables, taken by itself, gives anything rather than a hephthimimer; so that if it were at this point that our investigations terminated, little would be done towards the evolution of the *rationale* of the cæsura. It will appear, however, that in those cases where the circumstance of the sixth syllable being followed by two others in the same words, causes the eighth (or some syllable after the eighth) to be final, either a penthimimer cæsura, or an equivalent, will, with but few exceptions, be the result. This we may prove by taking the eighth syllable and counting back from it. What *follows* this syllable is immaterial: it is the number of syllables in the same word that *precedes* it that demands attention.

1. *The eighth syllable preceded in the same word by nothing.* — This is equivalent to the seventh syllable at the end of the preceding word: a state of things which, as noticed above, gives the hephthimimer cæsura.

Ανηριθμον γελάσμα παμ|μητορ δε γη.

2. *The eighth syllable preceded in the same word by one syllable.* — This is equivalent to the sixth syllable at the end of the word preceding; a state of things which, as noticed above, rarely occurs. When, however, it does occur, one of the three conditions under which a final syllable can take an arsis must accompany it. Each of these conditions requires notice.

a). With a non-enclitic *mono*-syllable the result is a penthimimer cæsura; since the syllable preceding a monosyllable is necessarily final.

Ἥκω σεβίζων σόν Κλύται|μνηστρα κρατος.

No remark has been made by critics upon lines constructed in this manner, since the cæsura is a penthimimer, and consequently their rules are undisturbed.

β). With *poly*-syllabic circumflex futures constituting the third foot, there would be a violation of the current rules respecting the cæsura. Notwithstanding this, if the views of the present paper be true, there would be no violation of the iambic character of the senarius. Against such a line as

Κἀγω το σον νεμιῶ ποθει|νον ανλιον

there is no argument *à priori* on the score of the iambic character being violated; whilst, in respect to objections derived from evidence *à posteriori*, there is sufficient reason for such lines being rare.

γ). With *poly*-syllables abbreviated by apocope, we have the state of things which the metrists have recognised under the name of quasi-cæsura; as —

Κεντειτε μη φειδέσθ' εγω | 'τεκον Παριν.

3. — *The eighth syllable preceded in the same word by two syllables.* — This is equivalent to the fifth syllable occurring at the end of the word preceding: a state of things which gives the penthimimer cæsura; as —

Οδμη βροτειων αἱματῶν | με προσγελα.
Λαμπρους δυναστας εμ΄πρεπον|τας αιθερι.
Ἀψυχον εικω πρόσγελω|σα σωματος.

4. *The eighth syllable preceded in the same word by three or more than three syllables.* — This is equivalent to the fourth (or some syllable preceding the fourth) syllable occurring at the end of the word preceding; a state of things which would include the third and fourth feet in one and the same word. This concurrence is denounced in the Supplement to the Preface to the Hecuba, where, however, the rule, as in the case of the quasi-cæsura, from being based upon merely empirical evidence, requires limitation. In lines like —

Και τἀλλα πολλ' επείκασαι | δικαιον ην,

or (an imaginary example),

Τοις σοισιν ασπιδήστροφοισ|ιν ανδρασι,

there is no violation of the iambic character, and consequently no reason against similar lines having been written; although from the average proportion of Greek words like *επεικασαι* and *ασπιδηστροφοισιν*, there is every reason for their being rare.

After the details just given the recapitulation is brief.

1. It was essential to the character of the senarius that the sixth syllable, or latter half of the third foot, should have an arsis, ictus metricus, or accent in the English sense. To this condition of the iambic rhythm the Greek tragedians, either consciously or unconsciously, adhered.

2. It was the character of the Greek language to admit an arsis on the last syllable of a word only under circumstances comparatively rare.

3. These two facts, taken together, caused the sixth syllable of a line to be anywhere rather than at the end of a word.

4. If followed by a single syllable in the same word, the result was a hephthimimer cæsura.

5. If followed by more syllables than one, some syllable in an earlier part of the line ended the word preceding, and so caused either a penthimimer, a quasi-cæsura, or the occurrence of the third and fourth foot in the same word.

6. As these two last-mentioned circumstances were rare, the general phenomenon presented in the Greek senarius was the occurrence of either the penthimimer or hephthimimer.

7. Respecting these two sorts of cæsura, the rules, instead of being exhibited in detail, may be replaced by the simple assertion that there should be an arsis on the sixth syllable. From this the rest follows.

8. Respecting the non-occurrence of the third and fourth feet in the same word, the assertion may be withdrawn entirely.

9. Respecting the quasi-cæsura, the rules, if not altogether withdrawn, may be extended to the admission of the last syllable of circumflex futures (or to any other polysyllables with an equal claim to be considered accented on the last syllable) in the latter half of the third foot.

REMARKS ON THE USE OF THE SIGNS OF ACCENT AND QUANTITY AS GUIDES TO THE PRONUNCIATION OF WORDS DERIVED FROM THE CLASSICAL LANGUAGES, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO ZOOLOGICAL AND BOTANICAL TERMS.

FROM THE

ANNALS AND MAGAZINE OF NATURAL HISTORY,

JUNE, 1859.

The text upon which the following remarks have suggested themselves is the Accentuated List of the British Lepidoptera, with Hints on the Derivation of the Names, published by the Entomological Societies of Oxford and Cambridge; a useful contribution to scientific terminology — useful, and satisfied with being so. It admits that naturalists may be unlearned, and provides for those who, with a love for botany or zoology, may have been denied the advantage of a classical education. That there are many such is well known; and it is also well known that they have no love for committing themselves to the utterance of Latin and Greek names in the presence of investigators who are more erudite (though, perhaps, less scientific) than themselves. As a rule, their pronunciation is inaccurate. It is inaccurate without being uniform — for the ways of going wrong are many. Meanwhile, any directions toward the right are welcome.

In the realities of educational life there is no such thing as a book for unlearned men — at least no such thing as a good one. There are make-shifts and make-believes *ad*

infinitum; but there is no such an entity as an actual book. Some are written down to the supposed level of the reader —all that are so written being useless and offensive. Others are encumbered with extraneous matter, and, so encumbered, err on the side of bulk and superfluity. Very rarely is there anything like consistency in the supply of information.

The work under notice supposes a certain amount of ignorance — ignorance of certain accents and certain quantities. It meets this; and it meets it well. That the work is both a safe and reliable guide, is neither more nor less than what we expect from the places and persons whence it has proceeded.

It is likely, from its very merits, to be the model on which a long line of successors may be formed. For this reason the principles of its notation (for thus we may generalize our expression of the principle upon which we use the signs of accent and quantity as guides to pronunciation) may be criticised.

In the mind of the present writer, the distinction between accent and quantity has neither been sufficiently attended to nor sufficiently neglected. This is because, in many respects, they are decidedly contrasted with, and opposed to, each other; whilst, at the same time — paradoxical as it may appear — they are, for the majority of practical purposes, convertible. That inadvertence on these points should occur, is not to be wondered at. Professional grammarians — men who deal with the purely philological questions of metre and syllabification — with few exceptions, confound them.

In English Latin (by which I mean Latin as pronounced by Englishmen) there is, in practice, no such a thing as quantity; so that the sign by which it is denoted is, in nine cases out of ten, superfluous. *Mark the accent, and the quantity will take care of itself.*

I say that there is no such a thing in English Latin as quantity. I ought rather to have said that

English quantities are not Latin quantities.

In Latin, the length of the syllable is determined by the length of the *vowels and consonants combined.* A long vowel, if followed in the same word by another (*i. e.* if followed by no consonant), is short. A short vowel, if followed by two consonants, is long. In English, on the other hand, long vowels make long, whilst short vowels make short, syllables; so that the quantity of a syllable in English is determined by the quantity of the vowel. The *i* in *pius* is short in Latin. In English it is long. The *e* in *mend* is short in English, long in Latin.

This, however, is not all. There is, besides, the following metrical paradox. A syllable may be made long by the very fact of its being short. It is the practice of the English language to signify the shortness of a vowel by doubling the consonant that follows. Hence we get such words as *pitted*, *knotty*, *massive*, &c. — words in which no one considers that the consonant is actually doubled. For do we not pronounce *pitted* and *pitied* alike? Consonants that appear double to the *eye* are common enough. Really double consonants — consonants that sound double to the ear — are rarities, occurring in one class of words only — viz. in compounds whereof the first element ends with the same sound with which the second begins, as *soul-less*, *book-case*, &c.

The doubling, then, of the consonant is a conventional mode of expressing the shortness of the vowel that precedes, and it addresses itself to the eye rather than the ear.

But does it address itself to the *eye* only? If it did, *pitied* and *pitted*, being sounded alike, would also be of the same quantity. We know, however, that to the English writer of Latin verses they are not so. We know that the first is short (*pĭtied*), the latter long (*pītted*). For all this, they are sounded alike: so that the difference in quantity (which, as a metrical fact, really exists) is, to a great degree, conventional. At any rate, we arrive at it by a secondary process. We know how the word is spelt; and we know that certain modes of spelling give certain rules of metre. Our senses here are regulated by our experience.

Let a classical scholar hear the first line of the Eclogues read —

Patulæ tu Tityre, &c.,

and he will be shocked. He will also believe that the shock fell on his ear. Yet his ear was unhurt. No sense was offended. The thing which was shocked was his knowledge of the rules of prosody — nothing more. To English ears there is no such a thing as quantity — not even in hexameters and pentameters. There is no such thing as quantity except so far as it is accentual also. Hence come the following phænomena — no less true than strange, — viz. (1) that any classical metre written according to the rules of quantity gives (within certain narrow limits) a regular recurrence of accents; and (2) that, setting aside such shocks as affect our knowledge of the rules of prosody, verses written according to their accents only give metrical results. English hexameters (such as they are) are thus written.

In the inferences from these remarks there are two assump-

tions: 1st, that the old-fashioned mode of pronunciation be adhered to; 2nd, that when we pronounce Greek and Latin words as they are pronounced in the recitation of Greek and Latin poetry, we are as accurate as we need be. It is by means of these two assumptions that we pronounce *Tityre* and *patulæ* alike; and I argue that we are free to do so. As far as the ear is concerned, the *a* is as long as the *i*, on the strength of the double *t* which is supposed to come after it. It *does* not indeed so come; but if it did, the sound would be the same, the quantity different (for is not *patulæ* pronounced *pattule*?). It would be a quantity, however, to the eye only.

This pronunciation, however, may be said to be exploded; for do not most men under fifty draw the distinction which is here said to be neglected? Do not the majority make, or fancy they make, a distinction between the two words just quoted? They may or they may not. It is only certain that, subject to the test just indicated, it is immaterial what they do. Nine-tenths of the best modern Latin verses were written under the old system — a system based not upon our ear, but on our knowledge of certain rules.

Now it is assumed that the accuracy sufficient for English Latin is all the accuracy required. Ask for more, and you get into complex and difficult questions respecting the pronunciation of a dead language. Do what we will, we cannot, on one side, pronounce the Latin like the ancient Romans. Do what we will, so long as we keep our accents right, we cannot (speaking Latin after the fashion of Englishmen) err in the way of quantity — at least, not to the ear. A short vowel still gives a long syllable; for the consonant which follows it is supposed to be doubled.

Let it be admitted, then, that, for practical purposes, *Tityre* and *patulæ* may be pronounced alike, and the necessity of a large class of marks is avoided. Why write, as the first word in the book is written, *Pāpilĭō'nidæ?* Whether the initial syllable be sounded *papp-* or *pape-* is indifferent. So it is whether the fourth be uttered as *-own-*, or *-onn-*. *As far as the ear is concerned*, they are both long, because the consonant is is doubled. In Greek, πᾰ̆ππιλλιόννιδαι is as long as πᾱπιλλιῶνιδαι.

Then comes *Machā'on*, where the sign of quantity is again useless, the accent alone being sufficient to prevent us saying either *Mákkaon* or *Makaón*. The *a* is the *a* in *fate*. We could not sound it as the *a* in *fat* if we would.

Pĭeridæ. — What does the quantity tell us here? That the *i* is pronounced as the *i* in the Greek πίονος, rather than

as the *i* in the Latin *pius*. But, in English Latin, we pronounce both alike. Surely *Pí'eris* and *Pie'ridæ* tell us all that is needed.

Cratæ'gī. — Whether long or short, the *i* is pronounced the same.

Sinā'pis, *Rā'pæ*, and *Nā'pi*. — The (¯) here prevents us from sayig *Rappæ* and *Nappi*. It would certainly be inelegant and unusual to do so. Tested, however, by the ear, the words *rappæ* and *nappi* take just the same place in an English Latin verse as *rape-æ* and *nape-i*. Is any one likely to say *sinappis?* Perhaps. There are those who say *Dianna* for *Diana*. It is very wrong to do so — wrong, not to say vulgar. For the purposes of metre, however, one is as good as the other; and herein (as aforesaid) lies the test. The real false quantities would be *Díana* and *sínnapis*; but against these the accent protects us. Nor is the danger of saying *sínappis* considerable. Those who say *Diánna* are those who connect it with *Anna* and would, probably, spell it with two *n's*.

Cardamí'nēs. — All that the first (¯) does here is to prevent us saying *cardamí'nnes*. The real false quantity would be *carda'mmines*. The accent, however, guards against this.

The second (¯) is useful. It is certainly better to say *cardamín-ees* than *cardamín-ess*, because the *e* is from the Greek η. And this gives us a rule. Let the (¯) be used to distinguish η from ε, and ω from ο, and in no other case. I would not say that it is necessary to use it even here. It is better, however, to say *Machāōn* than *Machā̆ōn*. By a parity of reasoning, the (˘), rejected in the work before us, is sometimes useful. Let it be used in those derivatives where ε replaces η, and ο replaces ω; *e. g.* having written *Machaōn*, write, as its derivative, *Machaŏnidæ* — *i. e.* if the word be wanted.

This is the utmost for which the signs of quantity are wanted for English Latin. I do not say that they are wanted even for this.

One of the mechanical inconveniences arising from the use of the signs of quantity is this — when a long syllable is accented, two signs fall upon it. To remedy this, the work before us considers that the stress is to be laid on the syllable *preceding the accent*. Yet, if an accent mean anything, it means that the stress fall on the syllable which it stands *over*.

A few remarks upon words like *Pīeridæ*, where the accent was omitted. — Here two short syllables come between two long ones. No accent, however, is placed over either. Evidently, quantity and accent are so far supposed to coincide, that the accentuation of a short vowel is supposed to make

it look like a long one. It is a matter of fact, that if, on a word like *Cassiŏpe*, we lay an accent on the last syllable but one, we shock the ears of scholars, especially metrical ones. Does it, however, lengthen the vowel? The editors of the work in question seem to think that it does, and, much more consistent than scholars in general, hesitate to throw it back upon the preceding syllable, which is short also. Metrists have no such objection; their practice being to say *Cassiope* without detriment to the vowel. The entomologists, then, are the more consistent.

They are, however, more consistent than they need be. If an accent is wanted, it may fall on the shortest of all possible syllables. Granting, however, that *Cassiŏpe* (whether the o be sounded as in *nōte* or *nŏt*) is repugnant to metre, and *Cassiope* to theory, what is their remedy? It is certainly true that *Cássiope* is pronounceable. Pope writes —

"Like twinkling stars the *miscellanies* o'er."

No man reads this *miscéllanies;* few read it *míscellánies*. The mass say *mís'cellanies*. Doing this, they make the word a quadrisyllable; for less than this would fall short of the demands of the metre. They also utter a word which makes *Cas'siope* possible. Is *Cássiope*, however, the sound? Probably not. And here authors must speak for themselves: —

"Take, *e. g.*, *Cassiope* and *Corticea:* in words like the former of these, in which the last syllable is long, there is no greater difficulty of pronunciation in laying the stress upon the first syllable than upon the second."

True! but this implies that we say *Cássiopé*. Is *-e*, however, one bit the longer for being accented, or can it bear one iota more of accent for being long? No. Take *-at* from *peat*, and *-t* from *pet*, and the result is *pe* — just as long or just as short in one case as the other.

The same power of accenting the first syllable is "particularly the case in those words in which the vowel *i* can assume the power of *y*. Latin scholars are divided as to the proper accentuation of *mulíeres*, *Tulliola*, and others: though custom is in favour of *muli'eres, mul'ieres* appears to be more correct." Be it so. Let *mulieres* be *mŭlyeres*. What becomes, however, of the fourth syllable? The word is no quadrisyllable at all. What is meant is this: — not that certain quadrisyllables with two short vowels in the middle are difficult to accentuate, but that they are certain words of which it is difficult to say whether they are trisyllables or quadrisyllables.

For all practical purposes, however, words like *Cassiope*

are quadrisyllables. They are, in the way of metre, choriambics; and a choriambic is a quadrisyllable foot. They were pronounced *Cassiope*, &c., by English writers of Latin verses — when Latin verses were written well.

Let the pronunciation which was good enough for Vincent Bourne and the contributors to the Musæ Etonenses be good enough for the entomologists, and all that they will then have to do is not to pronounce *cratægum* like *stratagem*, *cardamines* like *Theramenes*, and *vice versâ*. Against this, accent will ensure them — accent single-handed and without any sign of quantity — *Cardamines*, *Therámenes*, *cratæ'gum*, *strá-tagem*.

V.

CHRONOLOGICA.

ON THE MEANING OF THE WORD ΣΑΡΟΣ.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

APRIL 11, 1845.

The words σάρος and *sarus* are the Greek and Latin forms of a certain term used in the oldest Babylonian chronology, the meaning of which is hitherto undetermined. In the opinion of the present writer, the *sarus* is a period of 4 years and 340 days.

In the way of direct external evidence as to the value of the epoch in question, we have, with the exception of an unsatisfactory passage in Suidas, at the hands of the ancient historians and according to the current interpretations, only the two following statements: —

1. That each *sarus* consisted of 3600 years (ἔτη).

2. That the first ten kings of Babylon reigned 120 *sari*, equal to 432,000 years; or on an average 43,200 years apiece.

With *data* of this sort, we must either abandon the chronology altogether, or else change the power of the word *year*. The first of these alternatives was adopted by Cicero and Pliny, and doubtless other of the ancients — *contemnamus etiam Babylonios et eos qui e Caucaso cœli signa observantes numeris et motubus stellarum cursus persequuntur; condemnemus inquam hos aut stultitiæ aut vanitatis aut impudentiæ qui* CCCCLXX *millia annorum, ut ipsi dicunt, monumentis comprehensa continent.* — *Cic. de Divinat.*, from Cory's *Ancient Fragments*. Again — *e diverso Epigenes apud Babylonios* DCCXX *annorum observationes siderum coctilibus laterculis inscriptas docet, gravis auctor in primis: qui minimum Berosus et Critodemus* CCCCLXXX *anno-*

rum. — Pliny, vii. 56. On the other hand, to alter the value of the word ἔτος or *annus* has been the resource of at least one modern philologist.

Now if we treat the question by what may be called the *tentative* method, the first step in our inquiry will be to find some division of time which shall, at once, be *natural* in itself, and also short enough to make 10 *sari* possible parts of an average human life. For this, even a *day* will be too long. *Twelve hours*, however, or half a νυχθήμερον, will give us possible results.

Taking this view therefore, and leaving out of the account the 29th of February, the words ἔτος and *annus* mean, not a year, but the 730th part of one; 3600 of which make a *sarus*. In other words, a *sarus* = 1800 day-times and 1800 night-times, or 3600 half νυχθήμερα, or 4 years + 340 days.

The texts to which the present hypothesis applies are certain passages in Eusebius and Syncellus. These are founded upon the writings of Alexander Polyhistor, Apollodorus, Berosus, and Abydenus. From hence we learn the length of the ten reigns alluded to above, viz. 120 *sari* or 591 years and odd days. *Reigns* of this period are just possible. It is suggested, however, that the *reign* and *life* are dealt with as synonymous; or at any rate, that some period beyond that during which each king sat singly on his throne has been recorded.

The method in question led the late Professor Rask to a different power for the word *sarus*. In his *Ældste Hebraiske Tidregnung* he writes as follows: "The meaning of the so-"called *sari* has been impossible for me to discover. The "ancients explain it differently. Dr. Ludw. Ideler, in his "*Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, i. "207, considers it to mean some lunar period; without how-"ever defining it, and without sufficient closeness to enable "us to reduce the 120 *sari*, attributed to the ten ancient kings, "to any probable number of real years. I should almost "believe that the *sarus* was a year of 23 months, so that the "120 *sari* meant 240 natural years." *p.* 32. Now Rask's hypothesis has the advantage of leaving the meaning of the word *reign* as we find it. On the other hand, it blinks the question of ἔτη or *anni* as the parts of a *sarus*. Each doctrine, however, is equally hypothetical; the value of the *sarus*, in the present state of our inquiry, resting solely upon the circumstance of its giving a plausible result from plausible assumptions. The *data* through which the present writer asserts for his explanation the proper amount of probability are contained in two passages hitherto unapplied.

1. From Eusebius — *is* (Berosus) sarum *ex annis* 3600 *conflat. Addit etiam nescio quem* nerum *ac* sosum: nerum *ait* 600 *annis constare*, sosum *annis* 60. *Sic ille de veterum more annos computat.* — Translation of the Armenian Eusebius, p. 5, from *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, p. 439: Paris, 1841.

2. Berosus — σάρος δέ ἐστιν ἑξακόσια καὶ τρισχίλια ἔτη, νῆρος δὲ ἑξακόσια, σώσσος ἑξήκοντα. — From Cory's *Ancient Fragments*.

Now the assumed value of the word translated *year* (viz. 12 hours), in its application to the passages just quoted, gives for the powers of the three terms three divisions of time as natural as could be expected under the circumstances.

1. Σώσσος. — The *sosus* = 30 days and 30 nights, or 12 hours × 60, or a month of 30 days, μὴν τριακονθήμερος. Aristotle writes — ἡ μὴν Λακωνικὴ ἕκτον μέρος τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν ἡμέραι ἑξήκοντα. — From Scaliger, *De Emendatione Temporum*, p. 23. Other evidence occurs in the same page.

2. Νῆρος. — The *nerus* = 10 *sosi* or months = the old Roman year of that duration.

3. Σάρος. — The *sarus* = 6 *neri* or 60 months of 30 days each; that is, five proper years within 25 days. This would be a cycle or *annus magnus*.

All these divisions are probable. Against that of 12 hours no objection lies except its inconvenient shortness. The month of 30 days is pre-eminently natural. The year of 10 months was common in early times. In favour of the *sarus* of five years (or nearly so) there are two facts: —

1. It is the multiple of the *sosus* by 10, and of the *nerus* by 6.

2. It represents the period when the natural year of 12 months coincides for the first time with the artificial one of 10; since 60 months = 6 years of 10 months and 5 of 12.

The historical application of these numbers is considered to lie beyond the pale of the present inquiry.

In Suidas we meet an application of the principle recognised by Rask, viz. the assumption of some period of which the *sarus* is a fraction. Such at least is the probable view of the following interpretation: ΣΑΡΟΙ — μέτρον καὶ ἀριθμὸς παρὰ Χαλδαίοις, οἱ γὰρ ρκ' σάροι ποιοῦσιν ἐνιαυτοὺς βσκβ', οἳ γίγνονται ιη' ἐνιαυτοὶ καὶ μῆνες ἕξ. — From Cory's *Ancient Fragments**.

* This gloss in some MSS. is filled up thus: —
Σάροι. μέτρον καὶ ἀριθμὸς παρὰ Χαλδαίοις. οἱ γὰρ ρκ' σάροι ποιοῦσιν ἐνιαυτοὺς βσκβ', κατὰ τὴν τῶν Χαλδαίων ψῆφον, εἴπερ ὁ σάρος ποιεῖ μῆνας σεληνιακῶν σκβ', οἳ γίνονται ιη' ἐνιαυτοὶ καὶ μῆνες ἕξ.

In Josephus we find the recognition of an *annus magnus* containing as many ἔτη as the *nerus* did: ἔπειτα καὶ δι' ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν εὐχρηστίαν, ὧν ἐπενόουν ἀστρολόγιας καὶ γεωμέτριας πλέον ζῆν τὸν Θεὸν αὐτοῖς παρασχεῖν· ἅπερ οὐκ ἦν ἀσφαλῶς αὐτοῖς προειπεῖν μὴ ζήσασιν ἑξακοσίους ἐνιαυτούς· διὰ τοσοῦτον γὰρ ὁ μέγας ἐνιαυτὸς πληροῦται. — *Antiq.* i. 3.

The following doctrine is a suggestion, viz. that in the word *sosus* we have the Hebrew שׁשׁ = *six*. If this be true, it is probable that the *sosus* itself was only a secondary division, or some other period multiplied by six. Such would be a period of five days, or ten ἔτη (so-called). With this view we get two probabilities, viz. a subdivision of the month, and the alternation of the numbers 6 and 10 throughout; *i. e.* from the ἔτος* (or 12 hours) to the *sarus* (or five years).

* *
*

After the reading of this paper, a long discussion followed on the question, how far the *sarus* could be considered as belonging to historical chronology. The Chairman (Professor Wilson) thought there could be no doubt that the same principles which regulated the mythological periods of the Hindoos prevailed also in the Babylonian computations, although there might be some variety in their application.

1. A *mahayuga* or great age of the Hindoos, comprising the four successive *yugas* or ages, consists of 4,320,000 years.

2. These years being divided by 360, the number of days in the Indian lunar year, give 12,000 periods.

3. By casting off two additional cyphers, these numbers are reduced respectively to 432,000 and 120, the numbers of the years of the *saroi* of the ten Babylonian kings, whilst in the numbers 12,360 and 3600 we have the coincidence of other elements of the computation.

---

* In the course of the evening it was stated, that even by writers quoted by Syncellus ἔτος had been translated *day*; and a reference was made to an article in the Cambridge Philological Museum *On the Days of the Week*, for the opinion of Bailly in modern, and of Annianus and Panodorus in ancient times: ταῦτα ἔτη ἡμέρας ἐλογίσαντο στοχαστικῶς. — p. 40, vol. i. See also p. 42.

VI.

BIBLIOGRAPHICA.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF THE WORKS ON THE PROVINCIALISMS OF HOLLAND FROM PAPERS BY VAN DEN BERGH AND HETTEMA IN THE *TAALKUNDIG MAGAZIJN*.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Van den Bergh, *Taal. Mag.* ii. 2. 193—210.

GRONINGEN. — Laurman, *Proeve van kleine taalkundige bijdragen tot beter kennis van den tongval in de Provincie Groningen.* — Groningen 1822.

J. Sonius Swaagman, *Comment: de dialecto Groningana, etc.: una cum serie vocabulorum, Groninganis propriorum.* — Groning. 1827.

Zaamenspraak tusschen Pijter en Jaap dij malkáár op de weg ontmuiten boeten Stijntilpoorte. — Groninger Maandscrift, No. 1. Also in Laurman's *Proeve*.

Nieuwe Schuitpraatjes. — By the same author, 1836.

List van Groningsche Woorden. — By A. Complementary to the works of Laurman and Swaagman. With notes by A. de Jager. — Taalkundig Magazijn, second part, third number, pp. 331—334.

Groninsch Taaleigen door J. A. (the author of the preceding list). Taalkundig Magazijn, iv. 4. pp. 657—690.

Raize na Do de Cock. — Known to Van den Bergh only through the newspapers.

Subdialects indicated by J. A. as existing, (*a*) on the Friesland frontier, (*b*) in the Fens.

L. Van Bolhuis. — Collection of Groningen and Ommeland words not found in Halma's Lexicon; with notes by Clignett, Steenwinkel, and Malnoe. MS. In the library of the Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

Over-ijsel. — J. H. Halbertsma, *Proeve van een Woorden boekje van het Overijselsch.* — Overijsselschen Almanak voor Oudheid en Letteren, 1836.

M. Winhoff, *Landrecht var Auerissel, tweede druk, met veele* (philological as well as other) *aanteckeningen door J. A. Chalmot.* — Campen, 1782.

T. W. Van Marle, *Samensprôke tusschen en snaak zoo as as der gelukkig néët in te menigte zint en en heeren-krecht dée gien boe of ba zê, op de markt te Dêventer van vergange vrijdag.* — Overijselschen Almanak, &c. *ut supra.*

Over de Twenthsche Vocalen en Klankwijzigingen, door J. H. Behrens. — Taalkundig Magazijn, iii. 3. pp. 332—390. 1839.

Twenther Brulfteleed. — Overijsselschen Almanak.

Dumbar the Younger (?). — Three lists of words and phrases used principally at Deventer. MS. In the library of the Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

Drawings of twelve Overijssel Towns. Above and beneath each a copy of verses in the respective dialects. MS. of the seventeenth century. Library of the Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

Gelderland. — H. I. Swaving, *Opgave van eenige in Gelderland gebruikelijke woorden.* — Taalkundig Magazijn, i. 4. pp. 305.

Ibid. — *Ibid.* ii. 1. pp. 76—80.

Opmerkingen omtrent den Gelderschen Tongval. — *Ibid.* ii. 4. pp. 398—426. The fourth section is devoted to some peculiarities from the neighbourhood of Zutphen.

N. C. Kist, *Over de ver wisslingvan zedelijke en zinnelijke Hoedanigheden in sommige Betuwsche Idiotismen.* — Nieuwe Werken der Maatsch. van Nederl. Letterkund. iii. 2. 1834.

Staaltje van Graafschapsche landtal. — *Proeve van Taalkundipe Opmerkingen en Bedenkingen, door* T. G. C. Kalckhoff. — Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen for June 1826.

Appendix to the above. — *Ibid.* October 1826.

Het Zeumerroaisel: a poem. 1834? — Known to Van den Bergh only through the newspapers. Believed to have been published in 1834.

Et Schaassen-riejen, en praotparticken tussen Harmen en Barteld. — Geldersche Volks-Almanak, 1835. Zutphen Dialect.

De Öskeskermios. — Geldersche Volks-Almanak, 1836. Dialect of Over Veluwe.

Hoe Meister Maorten baordman baos Joosten en schat deevinden. — Geldersche Volks-Almanak, 1836. Dialect of Lijm.

Opgave van eenige in Gelderland gebruikelijke woorden ac. — H. 1. Swaving. — Taalk. Mag. iv. 4. pp. 307—330.

Aanteekeningen ter verbetering en uitbreiding der opmerkingen omtrent den Gelderschen Tongval. — Taal. Mag. iii. 1. pp. 39—80.

A. Van den Bergh. — Words from the provincial dialects of the Veluwen; with additions by H. T. Folmer. — MS. Library of the Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

Handbook, containing the explanation and etymology of several obscure and antiquated words, &c. occurring in the Gelderland and other neighbouring Law-books. — By J. C. C. V. H[asselt]. — MS. Library of the Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

HOLLAND. — *Scheeps-praat, ten overlijden van Prins Maurits van Orange.* — Huygens Korenbloemem, B. viii. Also in Lulofs Nederlandsche Spraakkunst, p. 351; in the Vaderlandsche Spreekwoorden door Sprenger van Eyk, p. 17, and (with three superadded couplets) in the Mnemosyne, part x. p. 76.

Brederoos Kluchten. — Chiefly in the Low Amsterdam (*plat Amsterdamsch*) dialect.

Hooft, *Warenar met den pot.*

Suffr. Sixtinus. — *Gerard van Velsen.* Amst. 1687.

Bilderdijk, *Over een oud Amsterdamsch Volksdeuntjen.* — Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen, 1808. Reprinted, with an appendix, at Leyden 1824.

Bilderdijk, *Rowbeklag; in gemeen Zamen Amsterdamschen tongval.* — Najaarsbladen, part i.

Gebel, *Scheviningsch Visscherslied.* — Almanak voor Blijgeestigen.

1. *Boertige Samenspraak, ter heilgroete bij een huwelijk.*

2. *Samenspraak over de harddraverij te Valkenburg en aan heet Haagsche Schouw.*

3. *Boertige Samenspraak tusschen Heeip en Jan-buur.* — These three last-named poems occur in Gedichten van J. Le Francq van Berkhey, in parts i. 221, ii. 180, ii. 257 respectively.

Twist tusschen Achilles en Agamemnon. Schimpraatje van eenen boer; of luimige vertaling van het 1e *Boek der Ilias*, by J. E. Van Varelen. — Mnemosyne, part iv. Dordrecht, 1824.

The same by H. W. and B. F. Tydeman in the Mnemosyne, part iv. Dordrecht, 1824.

Noordhollandsch Taaleigen, door Nicolas Beets. — Taalk. Magaz. iii. 4. pp. 510—516, and iv. 3. pp. 365—372.

List of words and phrases used by the Katwijk Fishermen. — MS. Library of the Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

Dictionary of the North-Holland Dialect; chiefly collected by Agge Roskan Kool. — MS. *Ibid.*

ZEALAND. — *Gedicht op't innemen van sommige schansen en de sterke stad Hulst, &c.* 1642. Le Jeune; Volkszangen, p. 190.

Brief van eene Zuidbevelandsche Boerin, aan haren Zoon, dienende bij de Zeeuwsche landelijke Schutterij. Zeeuwsche Volks-Almanak, 1836.

Over het Zeeuwsche Taaleigen, door Mr. A. F. Sifflé. — Taalkundig Magazijn i. 2. 169—174.

Notes upon the same, by Van A. D. J[ager]. — *Ibid.* p. 175—177.

Taalkundige Aanteekeningen, door Mr. J. H. Hoefft. — Ibid. 1. 3. 248—256.

Collection of words used in Walcheren. — MS. Library of Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

Collection of words used in States-Flanders. — MS. *Ibid.*

NORTH BRABANT. — J. H. Hoefft, *Proeve van Bredaasch taaleigen, &c.* — Breda 1836.

J. L. Verster, Words used in the Mayoralty of Bosch. — MS. Library of Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

JEWISH. — *Khootje, Waar binje? hof Conferensje hop de vertrekkie van de Colleesje hin de Poortoegeesche Koffy' uyssie, hover de gemasqwerde bal ontmaskert.* — Amsterd.

Lehrrhede hower de vrauwen, door Raphael Noenes Karwalje, Hopper Rhabbijn te Presburg; in Wibmer, de Onpartijdige. — Amst. 1820. p. 244.

NEGRO *. — *New Testament.* — Copenhagen, 1781, and Barby, 1802.

The Psalms. — Barby, 1802.

---

* From *Taal. Mag.* iii. 4. 500. In the 86th number of the Quarterly Review we find extracts from a New Testament for the use of the Negroes of Guiana, in the Talkee-takee dialect. In this there is a large infusion of Dutch, although the basis of the language is English.

VII.

GEOGRAPHICA.

ON THE EXISTENCE OF A NATION BEARING THE NAME OF *SERES* OR A COUNTRY CALLED *SERICA* OR *TERRA SERICA.*

FROM

THE CLASSICAL MUSEUM OF 1846. VOL. 3.

The following train of thought presented itself to the writer upon the perusal of Mr. James Yates's learned and interesting work entitled Textrinum Antiquorum or an account of the art of weaving among the ancients. With scarcely a single exception the facts and references are supplied from that work so that to the author of the present paper nothing belongs beyond the reasoning that he has applied to them.

This statement is made once for all for the sake of saving a multiplicity of recurring references.

The negative assertions as well as the positive ones are also made upon the full faith in the exhaustive learning of the writer in question.

Now the conviction that is come to is this, that no tribe, nation or country ever existed which can be shewn to have borne, either in the vernacular or in any neighbouring language, the name Seres, Serica, or Terra Serica or any equivalent term, a conclusion that may save some trouble to the inquirers into ancient geography.

The nation called Seres has never had a specific existence under that name. Whence then originated the frequent in-

dications of such a nation recurring in the writings of the ancients? The doctrine, founded upon the facts of Mr. Yates and laid down as a proposition, is as follows. —

That the name under which the article *silk* was introduced to the Greeks and Romans wore the appearance of a Gentile adjective and that the imaginary root of the accredited adjective passed for the substantive name of a nation. Thus, in the original form *seric*, the *-ic* had the appearance of being an adjectival termination, as in *Medic-us Persic-us* &c.; whilst *ser-* was treated as the substantive name of a nation or people from whence the article in question (i. e. the *seric* article) was derived. The *Seres* therefore were the hypothetical producers of the article that bore their name (*seric*). Whether this view involves more improbabilities than the current one will be seen from the forthcoming observations. —

1. In the first place the crude form *seric* was neither Latin nor Greek, so that the *-ic* could not be adjectival.

2. Neither was it in the simpler form *ser-* that the term was introduced into the classical languages so that the adjectival *-ic* might be appended afterwards. —

3. The name in question whatever might have been its remote origin was introduced into Greece from the Semitic tongues (probably the Phoenician) and was the word שרירק in Isaiah XIX. 9. where the יק (the *-ic*) is not an adjectival appendage but a radical part of the word. And here it may be well to indicate that, except under the improbable supposition that the Hebrew name was borrowed from the Greek or Latin, it is a matter of indifference whether the word in question was indigenous to the Semitic Languages or introduced from abroad, and also that is a matter of indifference whether silk was known in the time of the Old Testament or not. It is sufficient if a term afterwards applied to that article was Hebrew at the time of Isaiah. Of any connection between the substance called שרירק and a nation called Seres there is in the Semitic tongues no trace. The foundation of the present scepticism originated in the observation that the supposed national existence of the Seres coincided with the introduction of the term *seric* into languages where *ic-* was an adjectival affix. —

As early as the Augustan age the substantive *Seres* appears by the side of the adjective *Sericus*. In Virgil, Horace and Ovid the words may be found and from this time downwards the express notice of a nation so called is found through a long series of writers. —

Notwithstanding this it is as late as the time of Mela be-

fore we find any author mentioning with detail and precision a geographical nationality for the Seres. "He (Mela) describes them as a very honest people who brought what they had to sell, laid it down and went away and then returned for the price of it" (Yates p. 184) Now this notice is anything rather than definite. Its accuracy moreover may be suspected, since it belongs to the ambiguous class of what may be called convertible descriptions. The same story is told of an African nation in Herodotus IV. 169.

To the statement of Mela we may add a notice from Ammianus Marcellinus of the quiet and peaceable character of the Seres (XXIII. 6.) and a statement from the novelist Heliodorus that at the nuptials of Theagenes and Charielea the ambassadors of the Seres came bringing the thread and webs of their spiders (Aethiop. X. p. 494. Commelini).

Now notices more definite than the above of the national existence of the Seres anterior to the time of Justinian we have none whilst subsequently to the reign of that emperor there is an equal silence on the part both of historians and geographers. Neither have modern ethnographers found unequivocal traces of tribes bearing that name.

The probability of a confusion like the one indicated at the commencement of the paper is increased by the facts stated in p. 222. of the Textrinum. Here we see that besides Pausanias, Hesychius, Photius and other writers give two senses to the root *ser*-which they say is (1.) a worm (2.) the name of a nation. Probably Clemens Alexandrinus does the same *νῆμα χρυσοῦ, καὶ σῆρας Ἰνδικοὺς, καὶ τοὺς περιέργους βόμβυκας χαίρειν ἐῶντας.* A passage from Ulpian (Textrinum p. 192) leads to the belief that *σῆρας* here means silk-worm. Vestimentorum sunt omnia lanea lineaque, vel *serica* vel bombycina.

Finally the probability of the assumed confusion is verified by the statement of Procopius *αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ μέταξα, ἐξ ἧς εἰώθασι τὴν ἐσθῆτα ἐργάζεσθαι, ἣν πάλαι μὲν Ἕλληνες Μηδικὴν ἐκάλουν, τανῦν δὲ σηρικὴν ὀνομάζουσιν.* (De Bell. Persic. I. 20.).

Militating against these views I find little unsusceptible of explanation. —

1. The expression *σηρικα δερματα* of the author of the Periplus Maris Erythraei means skins from the silk country.

2. The intricacy introduced into the question by a passage of Procopius is greater. In the account of the first introduction of the silk worm into Europe in the reign of Justinian the monks who introduced it having arrived from India stated that they had long resided in the country called

Serinda inhabited by Indian nations where they had learned how raw silk might be produced in the country of the Romans (Textrinum p. 231). This is so much in favor of the root Ser- being gentile, but at the same time so much against the Seres being Chinese. Sanskrit scholars may perhaps adjust this matter. The Serinda is probably the fabulous Serendib.

In the countries around the original localities of the silkworm the name for silk is as follows —

In	Corean	*Sir.*
	Chinese	*se.*
	Mongolian	*sirkek.*
	Mandchoo	*sirghe.*

It is the conviction of the present writer that a nation called Seres had no geographical existence.

ON THE EVIDENCE OF A CONNECTION BETWEEN THE CIMBRI AND THE CHERSONESUS CIMBRICA.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

FEBRUARY 9, 1844.

It is considered that the evidence of any local connection between the Cimbri conquered by Marius, and the Chersonesus Cimbrica, is insufficient to counterbalance the natural improbability of a long and difficult national migration. Of such a connection, however, the identity of name and the concurrent belief of respectable writers are *primâ facie* evidence. This, however, is disposed of if such a theory as the following can be established, viz. that, for certain reasons, the knowledge of the precise origin and locality of the nations conquered by Marius was, at an early period, confused and indefinite; that new countries were made known without giving any further information; that, hence, the locality of the Cimbri was always pushed forwards beyond the limits of the geographical areas accurately ascertained; and finally, that thus their supposed locality retrograded continually northwards until it fixed itself in the districts of Sleswick and Jutland, where the barrier of the sea and the increase of geographical knowledge (with one exception) prevented it from getting farther. Now this view arises out of the examination of the language of the historians and geographers as examined in order, from Sallust to Ptolemy.

Of Sallust and Cicero, the language points to Gaul as the home of the nation in question; and that without the least intimation of its being any particularly distant portion of that country. "Per idem tempus adversus Gallos ab ducibus nostris, Q. Cæpione et M. Manlio, malè pugnatum — Marius Consul absens factus, et ei decreta Provincia Gallia." *Bell.*

Jugurth. 114. "Ipse ille Marius — influentes in Italiam Gallorum maximas copias repressit." *Cicero de Prov. Consul.* 13. And here an objection may be anticipated. It is undoubtedly true that even if the Cimbri had originated in a locality so distant as the Chersonese, it would have been almost impossible to have made such a fact accurately understood. Yet it is also true, that if any material difference had existed between the Cimbri and the Gauls of Gaul, such must have been familiarly known in Rome, since slaves of both sorts must there have been common.

Cæsar, whose evidence ought to be conclusive (inasmuch as he knew of Germany as well as of Gaul), fixes them to the south of the Marne and Seine. This we learn, not from the direct text, but from inference: "Gallos — a Belgis Matrona et Sequana dividit." *Bell. Gall.* i. "Belgas — solos esse qui, patrum nostrûm memoria, omni Galliâ vexatâ, Teutones Cimbrosque intra fines suos ingredi prohibuerunt." *Bell. Gall.* ii. 4. Now if the Teutones and Cimbri had moved from north to south, they would have clashed with the Belgæ first and with the other Gauls afterwards. The converse, however, was the fact. It is right here to state, that the last observation may be explained away by supposing, either that the Teutones and Cimbri here meant may be a *remnant* of the confederation on their *return*, or else a portion that settled down in Gaul upon their way; or finally, a division that made a circle towards the place of their destination in a south-east direction. None of these however seem the plain and natural construction; and I would rather, if reduced to the alternative, read "*Germania*" instead of "*Gallia*" than acquiesce in the most probable of them.

Diodorus Siculus, without defining their locality, deals throughout with the Cimbri as a Gaulish tribe. Besides this, he gives us one of the elements of the assumed indistinctness of ideas in regard to their origin, viz. their hypothetical connexion with the Cimmerii. In this recognition of what might have been called the *Cimmerian theory*, he is followed by Strabo and Plutarch. — *Diod. Sicul.* v. 32. *Strabo* vii. *Plutarch. Vit. Marii.*

The next writer who mentions them is Strabo. In confirmation of the view taken above, this author places the Cimbri on the northernmost limit of the area geographically known to him, viz. *beyond* Gaul and *in* Germany, between the Rhine and the Elbe: *τῶν δὲ Γερμάνων, ὡς εἶπον, οἱ μὲν προσάρκτιοι παροικοῦσι τῷ Ὠκεανῷ. Γνωρίζονται δ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκβολῶν τοῦ Ῥήνου λαβόντες τὴν ἀρχὴν μέχρι τοῦ Ἄλβιος. Τούτων δὲ εἰσὶ γνωριμώτατοι Σούγαμβροί τε καὶ Κίμβροι.*

Τὰ δὲ πέραν τοῦ Ἄλβιος τὰ πρὸς τῷ Ὠκεανῷ παντάπασιν ἄγνωστα ἡμῖν ἐστιν. (B. iv.) Further proof that this was the frontier of the Roman world we get from the statement which soon follows, viz. that "thus much was known to the Romans from their successful wars, and that more would have been known had it not been for the injunction of Augustus forbidding his generals to cross the Elbe." (B. iv.)

Velleius Paterculus agrees with his contemporary Strabo. He places them beyond the Rhine and deals with them as Germans: — "tum Cimbri et Teutoni transcendere Rhenum, multis mox nostris suisque cladibus nobiles." (ii. 9.) "Effusa — immanis vis Germanarum gentium quibus nomen Cimbris et Teutonis erat." (*Ibid.* 12.)

From the *Germania* of Tacitus a well-known passage will be considered in the sequel. Tacitus' locality coincides with that of Strabo.

Ptolemy. — Now the author who most mentions in detail the tribes beyond the Elbe is also the author who most pushes back the Cimbri towards the north. Coincident with his improved information as to the parts southward, he places them at the extremity of the area known to him: *Καῦχοι οἱ μείζονες μέχρι τοῦ Ἄλβιου ποταμοῦ· ἐφεξῆς δὲ ἐπὶ αὐχενα τῆς Κιμβρικῆς Χερσονήσου Σάξονες, αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Χερσόνησον· ὑπὲρ μὲν τοὺς Σάξονας, Σιγουλώνες ἀπὸ δυσμῶν· εἶτα Σαβαλίγγιοι, εἶτα Κόβανδοι, ὑπὲρ οὓς Χάλοι· καὶ ἔτι ὑπερτάτους δυσμικώτεροι μὲν Φουνδουσιοι, ἀνατολικώτεροι δὲ Χαροῦδες, πάντων δὲ αρκτικώτεροι Κύμβροι.* — *Ptolemæi Germania.*

Such is the evidence of those writers, Greek or Roman, who deal with the local habitation of the Cimbri rather than with the general history of that tribe. As a measure of the indefinitude of their ideas, we have the confusion, already noticed, between the Cimbri and Cimmerii, on the parts of Diodorus, Strabo, and Plutarch. A better measure occurs in the following extract from Pliny, who not only fixes the Cimbri in three places at once, but also (as far as we can find any meaning in his language) removes them so far northward as Norway: "Alterum genus Ingævones, quorum pars Cimbri Teutoni ac Chaucorum gentes. Proximi Rheno Istævones, quorum pars Cimbri mediterranei." (iv. 14.) "Promontorium Cimbrorum excurrens in maria longe Peninsulam efficit quæ Carthis appellatur." *Ibid.* "Sevo Mons (the mountain-chains of Norway) immanem ad Cimbrorum usque promontorium efficit sinum, qui Codanus vocatur, refertus insulis, quarum clarissima Scandinavia, incompertæ magnitudinis." (iv. 13.) Upon confusion like this it is not con-

sidered necessary to expend further evidence. So few statements coincide, that under all views there must be a misconception somewhere; and of such misconception great must the amount be, to become more improbable than a national migration from Jutland to Italy.

Over and above, however, this particular question of evidence, there stands a second one; viz. the determination of the Ethnographical relations of the nations under consideration. This is the point as to whether the Cimbri conquered by Marius were Celts or Goths, akin to the Gauls, or akin to the Germans; a disputed point, and one which, for its own sake only, were worth discussing, even at the expense of raising a wholly independent question. Such however it is not. If the Cimbri were Celts, the improbability of their originating in the Cimbric Chersonese would be increased, and with it the amount of evidence required; since, laying aside other considerations, the natural unlikelihood of a large area being traversed by a mass of emigrants is greatly enhanced by the fact of any intermediate portion of that area being possessed by tribes as alien to each other as the Gauls and Germans. Hence therefore the fact of the Cimbri being Celts will (if proved) be considered as making against the probability of their origin in the Cimbric Chersonese; whilst if they be shown to be Goths, the difficulties of the supposition will be in some degree diminished. Whichever way this latter point is settled, something will be gained for the historian; since the supposed presence of Celts in the Cimbric Chersonese has complicated more than one question in ethnography.

Previous to proceeding in the inquiry it may be well to lay down once for all as a postulate, that whatever, in the way of ethnography, is proved concerning any one tribe of the Cimbro-Teutonic league, must be considered as proved concerning the remainder; since all explanations grounded upon the idea that one part was Gothic and another part Celtic have a certain amount of *primâ facie* improbability to set aside. The same conditions as to the burden of proof apply also to any hypotheses founded on the notion of *retiring* Cimbri *posterior* to the attempted invasion of Italy. On this point the list of authors quoted will not be brought below the time of Ptolemy. With the testimonies anterior to that writer, bearing upon the question of the ethnography, the attempt however will be made to be exhaustive. Furthermore, as the question in hand is not so much the absolute fact as to whether the Cimbri were Celts or Goths, but one as to the amount of evidence upon which we believe them to be either

the one or the other, statements will be noticed under the head of evidence, not because they are really proofs, but simply because they have ever been looked upon as such. Beginning then with the Germanic origin of the Cimbro-Teutonic confederation, and dealing separately with such tribes as are separately mentioned, we first find the

Ambrones. — In the Anglo-Saxon poem called the Traveller's Song, there is a notice of a tribe called *Ymbre*, *Ymbras*, or *Ymbran*. Suhm, the historian of Denmark, has allowed himself to imagine that these represent the *Ambrones*, and that their name still exists in that of the island *Amron* of the coast of Sleswick, and perhaps in *Amerland*, a part of Oldenburg. — Thorpe's note on the Traveller's Song in the *Codex Exoniensis*.

Teutones. — In the way of evidence of there being Teutones amongst the Germans, over and above the associate mention of their names with that of the Cimbri, there is but little. They are not so mentioned either by Tacitus or Strabo. Ptolemy, however, mentions *a*) the Teutonarii, *b*) the Teutones: *Τευτονοάριοι καὶ Ουίρουνοι — Φαραδεινῶν δὲ καὶ Συήβων, Τεύτονες καὶ Ἄμαρποι.* Besides this, however, arguments have been taken from *a*) the meaning of the root *teut = people* (*þiuda*, M. G.; *þeód*, A. S.; *diot*, O. H. G.): *b*) the *Saltus Teutobergius: c*) the supposed connection of the present word *Deut-sch = German* with the classical word *Teutones*. These may briefly be disposed of.

a.) It is not unlikely for an invading nation to call themselves *the nation*, *the nations*, *the people*, &c. Neither, if the tribe in question had done so (presuming them to have been Germans or Goths), would the word employed be very unlike *Teuton-es*. Although the word *þiud-a = nation* or *people*, is generally strong in its declension (so making the plural *þiud-ôs*), it is found also in a weak form with its plural *thiot-ùn = Teuton-*. See *Deutsche Grammatik*, i. 630.

b.) The *Saltus Teutobergius* mentioned by Tacitus (*Ann.* i. 60) can scarcely have taken its name from a tribe, or, on the other hand, have given it to one. It means either *the hill of the people*, or *the city of the people;* according as the syllable *-berg-* is derived from *bâirgs = a hill*, or from *baúrgs = a city*. In either case the compound is allowable, *e. g.* diot-*wëc*, *public way*, O. H. G.; thiod-*scatho*, *robber of the people*, O. S.; þëód-*cyning*, þeod-*mearc*, *boundary of the nation*, A. S.; þiód-*land*, þiód-*vëgr*, *people's way*, Icelandic; — Theud-*e-mîrus*, Theud-*e-linda*, Theud-*i-gotha*, proper names (from *þiud-*): *himil*-bërac, *velt*-përac; *frîðu*-përac, O. H. G.; *himin*biörg, *val*biörg, Icelandic (from *bâirgs = hill*) — *asci*pure, *hasal*pure,

*saltz*purc, &c., O. H. G. (from *baürgs* = *city*). The particular word *diot-puruc* = *civitas magna* occurs in O. H. G. — See *Deutsche Grammatik*, iii. p. 478.

c. Akin to this is the reasoning founded upon the connection (real or supposed) between the root *Teut-* in *Teuton-*, and the root *deut-* in *Deut-sch*. It runs thus. The syllable in question is common to the word *Teut-ones*, *Teut-onicus*, *Theod-iscus*, *teud-iscus*, *teut-iscus*, *tût-iske*, *dût-iske*, *tiut-sche*, *deut-sch;* whilst the word *Deut-sch* means *German*. As the *Teut-ones* were Germans, so were the Cimbri also. Now this line of argument is set aside by the circumstance that the syllable *Teut-* in *Teut-ones* and *Teut-onicus*, as the names of the confederates of the Cimbri, is wholly unconnected with the *Teut-* in *theod-iscus*, and *Deut-sch*. This is fully shown by Grimm in his dissertation on the words *German* and *Dutch*. In its oldest form the latter word meant *popular*, *national*, *vernacular;* it was an adjective applied to the *vulgar tongue*, or the vernacular German, in opposition to the Latin. In the tenth century the secondary form *Teut-onicus* came in vogue even with German writers. Whether this arose out of imitation of the Latin form *Romanice*, or out of the idea of an historical connection with the Teutones of the classics, is immaterial. It is clear that the present word *deut-sch* proves nothing respecting the *Teutones*. Perhaps, however, as early as the time of Martial the word *Teutonicus* was used in a general sense, denoting the Germans in general. Certain it is that before his time it meant the particular people conquered by Marius, irrespective of origin or locality. — See Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik*, i. p. 17, 3rd edit. Martial, xiv. 26, *Teutonici capilli*. Claudian. in Eutrop. i. 406, *Teutonicum hostem*.

The *Cimbri*. — Evidence to the Gothic origin of the Cimbri (treated separately) begins with the writers under Augustus and Tiberius.

Vell. Paterculus. — The testimony of this writer as to the affinities of the nations in question is involved in his testimony as to their locality, and, consequently, subject to the same criticism. His mention of them (as Germans) is incidental.

Strabo. — Over and above the references already made, Strabo has certain specific statements concerning the Cimbri: *a.*) That according to a tradition (which he does not believe) they left their country on account of an inundation of the sea. This is applicable to Germany rather than to Gaul. This liability to inundations must not, however, be supposed to indicate a locality in the Cimbric Chersonese as well as

a German origin, since the coast between the Scheldt and Elbe is as obnoxious to the ocean as the coasts of Holstein, Sleswick and Jutland. *b.*) That against the German Cimbri and Teutones the Belgæ alone kept their ground — *ὥστε μόνους (Βέλγας) ἀντέχειν πρὸς τὴν τῶν Γερμάνων ἔφοδον, Κίμβρων καὶ Τευτόνων.* (iv. 3.) This is merely a translation of Cæsar (see above) with the interpolation *Γερμάνων. c.*) That they inhabited their original country, and that they sent ambassadors to Augustus — *καὶ γὰρ νῦν ἔχουσι τὴν χώραν ἣν εἶχον πρότερον, καὶ ἔπεμψαν τῷ Σεβαστῷ δῶρον τὸν ἱερώτατον παρ' αὐτοῖς, λέβητα, αἰτούμενοι φιλίαν καὶ ἀμνηστίαν τῶν ὑπουργμένων· τυχόντες δὲ ων ἠξίουν ἀφῆραν.* (B. i.) Full weight must be given to the definite character of this statement.

Tacitus. — Tacitus coincides with Strabo, in giving to the Cimbri a specific locality, and in stating special circumstances of their history. Let full weight be given to the words of a writer like Tacitus; but let it also be remembered that he wrote from hearsay evidence, that he is anything rather than an independent witness, that his statement is scarcely reconcileable with those of Ptolemy and Cæsar, and that above all the locality which both he and Strabo give the *Cimbri* is also the locality of the *Sicambri*, of which latter tribe no mention is made by Tacitus, although their wars with the Romans were matters of comparatively recent history. For my own part, I think, that between a confusion of the *Cimbri* with the *Cimmerii* on the one hand, and of the *Cimbri* with the *Sicambri* on the other, we have the clue to the misconceptions assumed at the commencement of the paper. There is no proof that in the eyes of the writers under the Republic, the origin of the Cimbri was a matter of either doubt or speculation. Catulus, in the History of his Consulship, commended by Cicero (*Brutus*, XXXV.), and Sylla in his Commentaries, must have spoken of them in a straightforward manner as Gauls, otherwise Cicero and Sallust would have spoken of them less decidedly. (See Plutarch's *Life of Marius*, and *note.*) Confusion arose when Greek readers of Homer and Herodotus began to theorize, and this grew greater when formidable enemies under the name of *Sicambri* were found in Germany. It is highly probable that in both Strabo and Tacitus we have a commentary on the lines of Horace —

> Te cæde gaudentes Sicambri
> Compositis venerantur armis.

"Eumdem (with the Chauci, Catti, and Cherusci) Germaniæ sinum proximi Oceano Cimbri tenent, parva nunc civitas,

sed gloria ingens: veterisque famæ lata vestigia manent, utrâque ripâ castra ac spatia, quorum ambitu nunc quoque metiaris molem manusque gentis, et tam magni exitus fidem — occasione discordiæ nostræ et civilium armorum, expugnatis legionum hibernis, etiam Gallias affectavêre; ac rursus pulsi, inde proximis temporibus triumphati magis quam victi sunt." (*German.* 38.)

Justin. — Justin writes — "Simul e *Germaniâ* Cimbros — inundâsse Italiam." Now this extract would be valuable if we were sure that the word *Germania* came from Justin's original, Trogus Pompeius; who was a Vocontian Gaul, living soon after the Cimbric defeat. To him, however, the term *Germania* must have been wholly unknown; since, besides general reasons, Tacitus says — "Germaniæ vocabulum recens et nuper additum: quoniam, qui primum Rhenum transgressi Gallos expulerint, ac nunc Tungri, tunc Germani vocati sint: ita nationis nomen, non gentis evaluisse paullatim, ut omnes, primùm a victore ob metum, mox a seipsis invento nomine *Germani* vocarentur." Justin's interpolation of *Germania* corresponds with the similar one on the part of Strabo.

Such is the evidence for the Germanic origin of the Cimbri and Teutones, against which may now be set the following testimonies as to their affinity with the Celts, each tribe being dealt with separately.

The Ambrones. — Strabo mentions them along with the Tigurini, an undoubted Celtic tribe — *Κατὰ τὸν πρὸς Ἄμβρωνας καὶ Τωϋγενοὺς πόλεμον.*

Suetonius places them with the Transpadani — "per Ambronas et Transpadanos." (*Cæsar*, § 9.)

Plutarch mentions that their war-cries were understood and answered by the Ligurians. Now it is possible that the Ligurians were Celts, whilst it is certain that they were not Goths.

The Teutones. — Appian speaks of the Teutones having invaded Noricum, and this under the head *Κέλτικα.*

Florus calls one of the kings of the Teutones Teutobocchus, a name Celtic rather than Gothic.

Virgil has the following lines: —

> . . . . . late jam tum ditione premebat
> Sarrastes populos, et quæ rigat æquora Sarnus;
> Quique Rufas, Batulumque tenent, atque arva Celennæ;
> Et quos maliferæ despectant mœnia Abellæ:
> *Teutonico* ritu soliti torquere *cateias.*
> Tegmina queis capitum raptus de subere cortex,
> Æratæque micant peltæ, micat æreus ensis. — *Æn.* vii. 737—743.

Now this word *cateia* may be a provincialism from the neighbourhood of Sarraste. It may also (amongst other things) be a true Teutonic word. From what follows it will appear that this latter view is at least as likely as any other. The commentators state that it is *vox Celtica*. That this is true may be seen from the following forms — Irish: *ga*, *spear*, *javelin; gaoth*, *ditto*, *a dart; goth*, *a spear* (O'Reilly); *gaothadh*, *a javelin; gadh*, *spear; gai*, *ditto; crann gaidh*, *spear-shaft* (Begly) — Cornish: *geu*, *gew*, *gu*, *gui* = *lance*, *spear*, *javelin*, *shaft* (Pryce) — Breton: *goas*, *goaff* (Rostremer).

The Cimbri — The Teutones. — Of either the Cimbri separately or of the Cimbri and Teutones collectively, being of Gallic origin, we have, in the way of direct evidence, the testimonies exhibited above, viz. of Sallust, Cicero, Cæsar, Diodorus. To this may be added that of Dion Cassius, who not only had access to the contemporary accounts which spoke of them as Gauls, but also was enabled to use them critically, being possessed of information concerning Germany as well as France.

Of Appian the whole evidence goes one way, viz. that the tribes in question were Gauls. His expressions are: *πλεῖστον τι καὶ μαχιμώτατον — χρῆμα Κελτῶν εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Γαλατίαν εἰσέβαλε.* (iv. 2.) In his book on Illyria he states that the Celts and Cimbri, along with the Illyrian tribe of the Autariæ, had, previous to the battle against Marius, attacked Delphi and suffered for their impiety. (*Ἰλλυρ. δ.* 4.)

Quintilian may be considered to give us upon the subject the notions of two writers — Virgil, and either Cæsar or Crassus. In dealing, however, with the words of Quintilian, it will be seen that there are two assumptions. That either Cæsar or Crassus considered the Cimbri to be Gauls we infer from the following passage: — "Rarum est autem, ut oculis subjicere contingat (*sc.* vituperationem), ut fecit C. Julius, qui cum Helvio Manciæ sæpius obstrepenti sibi diceret, *jam ostendam, qualis sis:* isque plane instaret interrogatione, qualem se tandem ostensurus esset, digito demonstravit imaginem Galli in scuto Mariano Cimbrico pictam, cui Mancia tum simillimus est visus. Tabernæ autem erant circum Forum, ac scutum illud signi gratiâ positum." *Inst. Orat.* vi. 3. 38. Pliny tells the story of Crassus (39. 4.). Although in this passage the word upon which the argument turns has been written *galli*, and translated *cock*, the current interpretation is the one given above. — *Vid. not.* ed. Gesner.

In the same author is preserved the epigram of Virgil's called Catalecta, and commented on by Ausonius of Bor-

deaux. Here we learn that T. Annius *Cimber* was a Gaul; whilst it is assumed that there was no other reason to believe that he was called *Cimber* than that of his being descended from some slave or freedman of that nation: — "Non appareat affectatio, in quam mirifice Virgilius,

> Corinthiorum amator iste verborum,
> Ille iste rhetor: namque quatenus totus
> Thucydides Britannus, Atticæ febres,
> *Tau*-Gallicum, *min*-, *al*- spinæ male illisit.
> Ita omnia ista verba miscuit fratri.

Cimber hic fuit a quo fratrem necatum hoc Ciceronis dictum notatum est; *Germanum Cimber occidit.*" — *Inst. Orat.* viii. 3. *cum not.*

> Dic, quid significent Catalecta Maronis? in his *al*-
> Celtarum posuit, sequitur non lucidius *tau*-,
> Et quod germano mistum male letiferum *min*-. — *Auson.*

Undoubtedly the pronunciation here ridiculed is that of the Gauls, and it is just possible that in it is foreshadowed the curtailed form that the Latin tongue in general puts on in the present French. Again, the slave whose courage failed him when ordered to slay Caius Marius is called both a Gaul and a Cimbrian by Plutarch, as well as by Lucan. In the latter writer we have probably but a piece of rhetoric (*Pharsalia*. lib. ii.)

Amongst tribes undoubtedly Gallic the Nervii claimed descent from the Teutones and Cimbri. The passage of Tacitus that connects the Nervii with the *Germans* connects them also with the Treveri. Now a well-known passage in St. Jerome tells us that the Treveri were Gauls: — *Νέρβιοι ἦσαν δὲ Κίμβρων καὶ Τευτόνων ἀπόγονοι.* — *Appian*, iv. 1. 4. "Treveri et Nervii circa adfectationem Germanicæ originis ultrò ambitiosi sunt, tamquam, per hanc gloriam sanguinis, a similitudine et inertiâ Gallorum separentur." *German.* 28. Finally, in the Life of Marius by Plutarch we have dialogues between the Cimbri and the Romans. Now a Gallic interpreter was probable, but not so a German one.

Such are the notices bearing upon the ethnography of the Cimbri. Others occur, especially amongst the poets; of these little or no use can be made, for a reason indicated above. Justin speaks of embassies between Mithridates and the Cimbri. Suetonius connects the Cimbri with the Gallic Senones; he is writing however about Germany, so that his evidence, slight as it is, is neutralized. Theories grounded upon the national name may be raised on both sides; *Cimbri*

may coincide with either the Germanic *kempa* = *a warrior* or *champion*, or with the Celtic *Cymry* = *Cambrians*. Equally equivocal seem the arguments drawn from the descriptions either of their physical conformation or their manners. The silence of the Gothic traditions as to the Cimbri being Germanic, proves more in the way of negative evidence than the similar silence of the Celtic ones, since the Gothic legends are the most numerous and the most ancient. Besides this, they deal very especially with genealogies, national and individual. The name of Bojorix, a Cimbric king mentioned in *Epitome Liviana* (lxvii.), is Celtic rather than Gothic, although in the latter dialects proper names ending in *-ric*, (*Alaric*, *Genseric*) frequently occur.

Measuring the evidence, which is in its character essentially cumulative, consisting of a number of details unimportant in themselves, but of value when taken in the mass, the balance seems to be in favour of the Cimbri, Teutones and Ambrones being Gauls rather than Germans, Celts rather than Goths.

An argument now forthcoming stands alone, inasmuch as it seems to prove two things at once, viz. not only the Celtic origin of the Cimbri, but, at the same time, their locality in the Chersonese. It is brought forward by Dr. Pritchard in his 'Physical History of Mankind,' and runs as follows: — (*a.*) It is a statement of Pliny that the sea in their neighbourhood was called by the Cimbri *Morimarusa*, or the *dead sea* = *mare mortuum*. (*b.*) It is a fact that in Celtic Welsh *mor marwth* = *mare mortuum*, *morimarusa*, *dead sea*. Hence the language of the Cimbric coast is to be considered as Celtic. Now the following facts invalidate this conclusion: — (1.) Putting aside the contradictions in Pliny's statement, the epithet *dead* is inapplicable to either the German Ocean or the Baltic. (2.) Pliny's authority was a writer named Philemon: out of the numerous Philemons enumerated by Fabricius, it is likely that the one here adduced was a contemporary of Alexander the Great; and it is not probable that at that time glosses from the Baltic were known in the Mediterranean. (3.) The subject upon which this Philemon wrote was the Homeric Poems. This, taken along with the geography of the time, makes it highly probable that the original Greek was not *Κίμβροι*, but *Κιμμέριοι*; indeed we are not absolutely sure of Pliny having written *Cimbri*. (4.) As applied to Cimmerian sea the epithet *dead* was applicable. (5.) The term *Morimarusa* = *mare mortuum*, although good Celtic, is better Slavonic, since throughout that stock of languages, as in many other of the Indo-European tongues

(the Celtic and Latin included), the roots *mor* and *mori* mean *sea* and *dead* respectively: — "Septemtrionalis Oceanus, Amalchium eum Hecatæus appellat, a Paropamiso amne, qua Scythiam alluit, quod nomen ejus gentis linguâ significat congelatum, Philemon *Morimarusam* a Cimbris (qu. *Cimmeriis*) vocari scribit: hoc est *mare mortuum* usque ad promontorium Rubeas, ultra deinde *Cronium*." (13.)

One point, however, still remains: it may be dealt with briefly, but it should not be wholly overlooked, viz. the question, whether over and above the theories as to the location of the Cimbri in the Cimbric Chersonese, there is reason to believe, on independent grounds, that Celtic tribes were the early inhabitants of the peninsula in question? If such were actually the case, all that has preceded would, up to a certain point, be invalidated. Now I know no sufficient reasons for believing such to be the case, although there are current in ethnography many insufficient ones.

1. In the way of Philology, it is undoubtedly true that words common to the Celtic tribes occur in the Danish of Jutland, and in the Frisian and Low German of Sleswick and Holstein; but there is no reason to consider that they belong to an aboriginal Celtic tribe. The *à priori* probability of Celts in the peninsula involves hypotheses in ethnography which are, to say the least, far from being generally recognized. The evidence as to the language of aborigines derived from the significance of the names of old geographical localities is wanting for the Cimbric Chersonese.

2. No traditions, either Scandinavian or German, point towards an aboriginal Celtic population for the localities in question.

3. There are no satisfactory proofs of such in either Archæology or Natural History. A paper noticed by Dr. Pritchard of Professor Eschricht's upon certain Tumuli in Jutland states, that the earliest specimens of art (anterior to the discovery of metals), as well as the character of the tumuli themselves, have a Celtic character. He adds, however, that the character of the tumuli is as much Siberian as Celtic. The early specimens of art are undoubtedly like similar specimens found in England. It happens, however, that such things are in *all* countries more or less alike. In Professor Siebold's museum at Leyden, stone-axes from tumuli in Japan and Jutland are laid side by side, for the sake of comparison, and between them there is no perceptible difference. The oldest skulls in these tumuli are said to be other than Gothic. They are, however, Finnic rather than Celtic.

4. The statement in Tacitus (*German.* 44.), that a nation on

the Baltic called the Æstii spoke a language somewhat akin to the British, cannot be considered as conclusive to the existence of Celts in the North of Germany. Any language, not German, would probably so be denoted. Such might exist in the mother-tongue of either the Lithuanic or the Esthonian.

It is considered that in the foregoing pages the following propositions are either proved or involved: — 1. That the Cimbri conquered by Marius came from either Gaul or Switzerland, and that they were Celts. 2. That the Teutones and Ambrones were equally Celtic with the Cimbri. 3. That no nation north of the Elbe was known to Republican Rome. 4. That there is no evidence of Celtic tribes ever having existed north of the Elbe. 5. That the epithet *Cimbrica* applied to the Chersonesus proves nothing more in respect to the inhabitants of that locality than is proved by words like *West Indian* and *North-American Indian*. 6. That in the word *cateia* we are in possession of a new Celtic gloss. 7. That in the term *Morimarusa* we are in possession of a gloss at once Cimmerian and Slavonic. 8. That for any positive theory as to the Cimbro-Teutonic league we have at present no data, but that the hypothesis that would reconcile the greatest variety of statements would run thus: viz. that an organized Celtic confederation conterminous with the Belgæ, the Ligurians, and the Helvetians descended with its eastern divisions upon Noricum, and with its western ones upon Provence.

ADDENDA.

JANUARY 1859.

(1)

In this paper the notice of the Monumentum Ancyranum is omitted. It is CIMBRIQVE ET CHRIIDES ET SEMNONES ET EJVSDEM TRACTVS ALII GERMANORVM POPVLI PER LEGATOS AMICITIAM MEAM ET POPVLI ROMANI PETIERVNT. This seems to connect itself with Strabo's notice. It may also connect itself with that of Tacitus. Assuming the CHARIIDES to be the Harudes, and the Harudes to be the Cherusci (a doctrine for which I have given reasons in my edition of the Germania) the position of the Cimbri in the text of Tacitus is very nearly that of them in the Inscription. In the inscription, the order is Cimbri, Harudes, Semnones; in Tacitus, Cherusci, Cimbri, Semnones. In both cases the 3 names are associated.

(2)

I would now modify the proposition with which the preceding dissertation concludes, continuing, however, to hold the main doctrine of the text, viz. the fact of the Cimbri having been unknown in respect to their name and locality and, so, having been pushed northwards, and more northwards still, as fresh areas were explored without supplying an undoubted and unequivocal origin for them.

I think that the Ambrones, the Tigurini, and the Teutones were Gauls of Helvetia, and South Eastern Gallia, and that the alliance between them and the Cimbri (assuming it to be real) is *primâ facie* evidence of the latter being Galli also. But it is no more.

That the Cimbri were the Eastern members of the confederation seems certain. More than one notice connects them with Noricum. *Here* they may have been native. They may also have been intrusive.

Holding that the greater part of Noricum was Slavonic, and that almost all the country along its northern and eastern frontier was the same, I see my way to the Cimbri having been Slavonic also. That they were Germans is out of the question. Gauls could hardly have been so unknown and mysterious to the Ro-

mans. Gaul they knew well, and Germany sufficiently — yet no where did they find Cimbri.

The evidence of Posidonius favours this view. "He" writes Strabo "does not unreasonably conceive that these Cimbri being "predatory and wandering might carry their expeditions as far as "the Mæotis, and that the Bosporus might, from them, take its "name of *Cimmerian*, i. e. *Cimbrian*, the Greeks calling the *Cimbri* "*Cimmerii*. He says that the Boii originally inhabited the Hercy- "nian Forest, that the Cimbri attacked them, that they were re- "pulsed, that they then descended on the Danube, and the coun- "try of the Scordisci who are Galatæ; thence upon the Taurisci, who "are also Galatæ, then upon the Helvetians &c. — *Strabo.* 7, p. 293.

For a fuller explanation of the doctrine which makes the Cimbri possible Slavonians see my Edition of Prichard's origin of the Celtic nations — *Supplementary Chapter — Ambrones*, *Tigurini*, *Teutones*, *Boii*, *Slavonic hypothesis* &c.

ON THE ORIGINAL EXTENT OF THE SLAVONIC AREA.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

FEBRUARY 8, 1850.

The current opinion, that a great portion of the area now occupied by Slavonians, and a still greater portion so occupied in the ninth and tenth centuries, were, in the times of Cæsar and Tacitus, either German, or something other than what it is found to be at the beginning of the period of authentic and contemporary history, has appeared so unsatisfactory to the present writer, that he has been induced to consider the evidence on which it rests. What (for instance) are the grounds for believing that, in the *first* century, Bohemia was not just as Slavonic as it is now? What the arguments in favour of a Germanic population between the Elbe and Vistula in the *second?*

The fact that, at the very earliest period when any definite and detailed knowledge of either of the parts in question commences, both are as little German as the Ukraine is at the present moment, is one which no one denies. How many, however, will agree with the present writer in the value to be attributed to it, is another question. For his own part, he takes the existence of a given division of the human race (whether Celtic, Slavonic, Gothic or aught else) on a given area, as a sufficient reason for considering it to have been indigenous or aboriginal to that area, *until reasons be shown to the contrary.* Gratuitous as this postulate may seem in the first instance, it is nothing more than the legitimate deduction from the rule in reasoning which forbids us to multiply causes unnecessarily. Displacements therefore, conquests, migrations, and the other disturbing causes are not to be assumed, merely for the sake of accounting for assumed changes, but to be supported by specific evidence; which evidence, in its turn, must have a ratio to the probability or the improbability of the disturbing causes

alleged. These positions seem so self-evident, that it is only by comparing the amount of improbabilities which are accepted with the insufficiency of the testimony on which they rest, that we ascertain, from the extent to which they have been neglected, the necessity of insisting upon them.

The ethnological condition of a given population at a certain time is *primâ facie* evidence of a similar ethnological condition at a previous one. The testimony of a writer as to the ethnological condition of a given population at a certain time is also *primâ facie* evidence of such a condition being a real one; since even the worst authorities are to be considered correct until reasons are shown for doubting them.

It now remains to see how far these two methods are concordant or antagonistic for the area in question; all that is assumed being, that when we find even a good writer asserting that at one period (say the third century) a certain locality was German, whereas we know that at a subsequent one (say the tenth) it was other than German, it is no improper scepticism to ask, whether it is more likely that the writer was mistaken, or that changes have occurred in the interval; in other words, if error on the one side is not to be lightly assumed, neither are migrations, &c. on the other. Both are likely, or unlikely, according to the particular case in point. It is more probable that an habitually conquering nation should have displaced an habitually conquered one, than that a bad writer should be wrong. It is more likely that a good writer should be wrong than that an habitually conquered nation should have displaced an habitually conquering one.

The application of criticism of this sort materially alters the relations of the Celtic, Gothic, Roman and Slavonic populations, giving to the latter a prominence in the ancient world much more proportionate to their present preponderance as a European population than is usually admitted.

Beginning with the south-western frontier of the present Slavonians, let us ask what are the reasons against supposing the population of Bohemia to have been in the time of Cæsar other than what it is now, *i. e.* Slavonic.

In the first place, if it were not so, it must have changed within the historical period. If so, when? No writer has ever grappled with the details of the question. It could scarcely have been subsequent to the development of the Germanic power on the Danube, since this would be within the period of annalists and historians, who would have mentioned it. As little is it likely to have been during the time when the Goths and Germans, victorious everywhere, were displacing others rather than being displaced themselves.

The evidence of the language is in the same direction. Whence could it have been introduced? Not from the Saxon frontier, since there the Slavonic is Polish rather than Bohemian. Still less from the Silesian, and least of all from the Bavarian. To have developed its differential characteristics, it must have had either Bohemia itself as an original locality, or else the parts south and east of it.

We will now take what is either an undoubted Slavonic locality, or a locality in the neighbourhood of Slavonians, *i. e.* the country between the rivers Danube and Theiss and that range of hills which connect the Bakonyer-wald with the Carpathians, the country of the *Jazyges*. Now as *Jazyg* is a Slavonic word, meaning *speech* or *language*, we have, over and above the external evidence which makes the Jazyges Sarmatian, internal evidence as well; evidence subject only to one exception, viz. that perhaps the name in question was not native to the population which it designated, but only a term applied by some Slavonic tribe to some of their neighbours who might or might not be Slavonic. I admit that this is possible, although the name is not of the kind that would be given by one tribe to another different from itself. Admitting, however, this, it still leaves a Slavonic population in the contiguous districts; since, whether borne by the people to whom it was applied or not, *Jazyg* is a Slavonic gloss from the Valley of the Tibiscus.

Next comes the question as to the *date* of this population. To put this in the form least-favourable to the views of the present writer, is to state that the first author who mentions a population in these parts, either called by others or calling itself *Jazyges*, is a writer so late as Ptolemy, and that he adds to it the qualifying epithet *Metanastæ* (*Μετανάσται*), a term suggestive of their removal from some other area, and of the recent character of their arrival on the Danube. Giving full value to all this, there still remains the fact of primary importance in all our investigations on the subject in question, viz. that in the time of Ptolemy (at least) there were Slavonians on (or near) the river Theiss.

At present it is sufficient to say that there are no *à priori* reasons for considering these Jazyges as the most western of the branch to which they belonged, since the whole of the Pannonians may as easily be considered Slavonic as aught else. They were not Germans. They were not Celts; in which case the common rules of ethnological criticism induce us to consider them as belonging to the same class with the population conterminous to them; since unless we do this, we must assume a new division of the human species alto-

gether; a fact, which, though possible, and even probable, is not lightly to be taken up.

So much for the *à priori* probabilites: the known facts by no means traverse them. The Pannonians, we learn from Dio, were of the same class with the Illyrians, *i. e.* the northern tribes of that nation. These must have belonged to one of three divisions; the Slavonic, the Albanian, or some division now lost. Of these, the latter is not to be assumed, and the first is more probable than the second. Indeed, the more we make the Pannonians and Illyrians other than Slavonic, the more do we isolate the *Jazyges;* and the more we isolate these, the more difficulties we create in a question otherwise simple.

That the portion of Pannonia to the north of the Danube (*i. e.* the north-west portion of Hungary, or the valley of the Waag and Gran) was different from the country around the lake Peiso (Pelso), is a position, which can only be upheld by considering it to be the country of the Quadi, and the Quadi to have been Germanic; — a view, against which there are numerous objections.

Now, here re-appears the term Daci; so that we must recognise the important fact, that east of the *Jazyges* there are the Dacians (and Getæ) of the Lower, and west of the *Jazyges* the Daci of the Upper Danube. These must be placed in the same category, both being equally either Slavonic or non-Slavonic.

a. Of these alternatives, the first involves the following real or apparent difficulty, *i. e.* that, if the Getæ are what the Daci are, the Thracians are what the Getæ are. Hence, if all three be Slavonic, we magnify the area immensely, and bring the Slavonians of Thrace in contact with the Greeks of Macedonia. Granted. But are there any reasons against this? So far from there being any such in the nature of the thing itself, it is no more than what is actually the case at the present moment.

b. The latter alternative isolates the *Jazyges*, and adds to the difficulties created by their ethnological position, under the supposition that they are the only Slavonians of the parts in question; since if out-lyers to the area (*exceptional*, so to say), they must be either invaders from without, or else relics of an earlier and more extended population. If they be the former, we can only bring them from the north of the Carpathian mountains (a fact not in itself improbable, but not to be assumed, except for the sake of avoiding greater difficulties); if the latter, they prove the original Slavonic character of the area.

The present writer considers the Daci then (western and eastern) as Slavonic, and the following passage brings them as far west as the *Maros* or *Morave*, which gives the name to the present Moravians, a population at once Slavonic and Bohemian: — "Campos et plana Jazyges Sarmatæ, montes vero et saltus pulsi ab his Daci ad Pathissum amnem a Maro sive Duria . . . . tenent." — *Plin.* iv. 12.

The evidence as to the population of Moravia and North-eastern Hungary being Dacian, is Strabo's *Γέγονε . . . . τῆς χώρας μερισμὸς συμμένων ἐκ παλαιοῦ· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ Δάκους προσαγορεύουσι, τους δὲ Γέτας, Γέτας μὲν πρὸς τὸν Πόντον κεκλιμένους, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἕω, Δάκους δὲ τοὺς εἰς τἀνάντια πρὸς Γερμανίαν καὶ τὰς τοῦ Ἴστρου πήγας.* — From Zeuss, in *vv. Getæ, Daci.*

In Moravia we have as the basis of argument, an *existing* Slavonic population, speaking a language identical with the Bohemian, but different from the other Slavonic languages, and (as such) requiring a considerable period for the evolution of its differential characters. This brings us to Bohemia. At present it is Slavonic. When did it begin to be otherwise? No one informs us on this point. Why should it not have been so *ab initio*, or at least at the beginning of the historical period for these parts? The necessity of an answer to this question is admitted; and it consists chiefly (if not wholly) in the following arguments; — *a.* those connected with the term *Marcomanni; b.* those connected with the term *Boiohemum.*

a. Marcomanni. — This word is so truly Germanic, and so truly capable of being translated into English, that those who believe in no other etymology whatever may believe that *Marc-o-manni*, or *Marchmen*, means the *men of the* (*boundaries*) *marches;* and without overlooking either the remarks of Mr. Kemble on the limited nature of the word *mearc*, when applied to the smaller divisions of land, or the doctrine of Grimm, that its primary signification is *wood* or *forest*, it would be an over-refinement to adopt any other meaning for it in the present question than that which it has in its undoubted combinations, *Markgrave*, *Altmark*, *Mittelmark*, *Ukermark*, and the *Marches of Wales and Scotland.* If so, it was the name of a line of *enclosing frontier* rather than of an *area enclosed*; so that to call a country like the *whole* of Bohemia, *Marcomannic*, would be like calling *all* Scotland or *all* Wales *the Marches.*

Again, as the name arose on the western, Germanic or Gallic side of the *March*, it must have been the name of an *eastern* frontier in respect to Gaul and Germany; so that to

suppose that there were Germans on the Bohemian line of the *Marcomanni*, is to suppose that the *march* was no *mark* (or boundary) at all, at least in an *ethnological* sense. This qualification involves a difficulty which the writer has no wish to conceal; a *march* may be other than an *ethnological* division. It may be a *political* one. In other words, it may be like the Scottish Border, rather than like the Welsh and the Slavono-Germanic marches of Altmark, Mittelmark and Ukermark. At any rate, the necessity for a *march* being a line of frontier rather than a large compact kingdom, is conclusive against the whole of Bohemia having been Germanic *because it was Marcomannic.*

b. The arguments founded on the name *Boiohemum* are best met by showing that the so-called *country* (*home*) *of the Boii* was not *Bohemia* but *Bavaria*. This will be better done in the sequel than now. At present, however, it may be as well to state that so strong are the facts in favour of *Boiohemum* and *Baiovarii* meaning, not the one Bohemia and the other Bavaria, but *one of the two countries*, that Zeuss, one of the strongest supporters of the doctrine of an originally Germanic population in Bohemia, applies both of them to the firstnamed kingdom; a circumstance which prepares us for expecting, that if the names fit the countries to which they apply thus loosely, *Boiohemum* may as easily be *Bavaria*, as the country of the *Baiovarii* be *Bohemia*; in other words, that we have a *convertible form* of argument.

ADDENDA (1859).

(1)

Too much stress is, perhaps, laid on the name Jazyges. The fact of the word Jaszag in Magyar meaning a *bowman* complicates it. The probability, too, of the word for *Language* being the name of a nation is less than it is ought to be, considering the great extent to which it is admitted.

(2)

The statements respecting Bohemia are over-strong. *Some* portion of it was, probably, Marcomannic and German. The greater part, however, of the original Boio-*hem*-um, or *home* of the Boii, I still continue to give to the country of the *Boian occupants* — Baio-*var*-ii = *Bavaria*; the word itself being a compound of the same kind as Cant-*wære* = *inhabitants of Kent.* (See Zeuss in *v. Baiovarii*).

ON THE ORIGINAL EXTENT OF THE SLAVONIC AREA.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

MARCH 8, 1850.

The portion of the Slavonic frontier which will be considered this evening is the north-western, beginning with the parts about the Cimbric peninsula, and ending at the point of contact between the present kingdoms of Saxony and Bohemia; the leading physical link between the two extreme populations being the Elbe.

For this tract, the historical period begins in the ninth century. The classification which best shows the really westerly disposition of the Slavonians of this period, and which gives us the fullest measure of the extent to which, *at that time at least*, they limited the easterly extension of the Germans, is to divide them into — *a.* the Slavonians of the Cimbric peninsula; *b.* the Slavonians of the right bank of the Elbe; *c.* the Slavonians of the *left* bank of the Elbe; the first and last being the most important, as best showing the amount of what may be called the *Slavonic protrusion into the accredited Germanic area.*

a. The Slavonians of the Cimbric Peninsula. — Like the Slavonians that constitute the next section, these are on the right bank of the Elbe; but as they are *north* of that river rather than *east* of it, the division is natural.

The Wagrians. — Occupants of the country between the Trave and the upper portion of the southern branch of the Eyder.

The Polabi.— Conterminous with the Wagrians and the Saxons of Sturmar, from whom they were separated by the river Bille.

b. Slavonians of the right bank of the Elbe. — *The Obodriti.* — This is a generic rather than a specific term; so that it

is probable that several of the Slavonic populations about to be noticed may be but subdivisions of the great Obotrit section. The same applies to the divisions already noticed — the Wagri and Polabi: indeed the classification is so uncertain, that we have, for these parts and times, no accurate means of ascertaining whether we are dealing with *sub*-divisions or *cross*-divisions of the Slavonians. At any rate the word *Obotriti* was one of the best-known of the whole list; so much so, that it is likely, in some cases, to have equalled in import the more general term *Wend*. The varieties of orthography and pronunciation may be collected from Zeuss (*in voce*), where we find *Obotriti*, *Obotritæ*, *Abotriti*, *Abotridi*, *Apodritæ*, *Abatareni*, *Apdrede*, *Abdrede*, *Abtrezi*. Furthermore, as evidence of the generic character of the word, we find certain *East-Obotrits* (*Oster-Abtrezi*), conterminous with the Bulgarians, as well as the *North-Obotrits* (*Nort-Abtrezi*), for the parts in question. These are the northern districts of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, from the Trave to the Warnow, chiefly along the coast. Zeuss makes Schwerin their most inland locality. The *Descriptio Civitatum* gives them fifty-three towns.

In the more limited sense of the term, the Obotrits are not conterminous with any German tribe, being separated by the Wagri and Polabi. Hence when Alfred writes *Norðan Eald-Seaxum is Apdrede*, he probably merges the two sections last-named in the Obotritic.

Although not a frontier population, the Obotrits find place in the present paper. They show that the Wagri and Polabi were not mere isolated and outlying portions of the great family to which they belonged, but that they were in due continuity with the main branches of it.

Varnahi. — This is the form which the name takes in Adam of Bremen. It is also that of the Varni, Varini, and Viruni of the classical writers; as well as of the Werini of the Introduction to the *Leges Angliorum et Werinorum, hoc est Thuringorum*. Now whatever the Varini of Tacitus may have been, and however much the affinities of the Werini were with the Angli, the Varnahi of Adam of Bremen are Slavonic.

c. Cis-Albian Slavonians. — Beyond the boundaries of the Duchies of Holstein and Lauenburg, the existence of Germans on the right bank of the Elbe is *nil*.

With Altmark the evidence of a Slavonic population changes, and takes strength. The present Altmark is not German, as Kent is Saxon, but only as Cornwall is, *i. e.* the traces of the previous Slavonic population are like the traces of the Celtic occupants of Cornwall, the rule rather than

the exception. Most of the geographical names in Altmark are Slavonic, the remarkable exception being the name of the *Old March* itself.

The Slavono-German frontier for the parts south of Altmark becomes so complex as to require to stand over for future consideration. All that will be done at present is to indicate the train of reasoning applicable here, and applicable along the line of frontier. If such was the state of things in the eighth and ninth centuries, what reason is there for believing it to have been otherwise in the previous ones? The answer is the testimony of Tacitus and others in the way of external, and certain etymologies, &c. in the way of internal, evidence. Without at present saying anything in the way of disparagement to either of these series of proofs, the present writer, who considers that the inferences which have generally been drawn from them are illegitimate, is satisfied with exhibiting the amount of *à priori* improbability which they have to neutralize. If, when Tacitus wrote, the area between the Elbe and Vistula was not Slavonic, but Gothic, the Slavonians of the time of Charlemagne must have immigrated between the second and eighth centuries; must have done so, not in parts, but for the whole frontier; must have, for the first and last time, displaced a population which has generally been the conqueror rather than the conquered; must have displaced it during one of the strongest periods of its history; must have displaced it everywhere, and wholly; and (what is stranger still) that not permanently — since from the time in question, those same Germans, who between A. 200 and A.D. 800 are supposed to have always retreated before the Slavonians, have from A.D. 800 to A.D. 1800 always reversed the process and encroached upon their former dispossessors.

ADDENDA (1859).

(1)

The details of the Slavonic area to the south of Altmark are as follows.

Brandenburg, at the beginning of the historical period, was Slavonic, and one portion of it, the Circle of Cotbus, is so at the present moment. It is full of geographical names significant in the Slavonic languages. Of Germans to the East of the Elbe

there are no signs until after the time of Charlemagne. But the Elbe is not even their eastern boundary. The Saale is the river which divides the Slavonians from the Thuringians — not only at the time when its drainage first comes to be known, but long afterwards. More than this, there were, in the 11th and 12th centuries, Slavonians in Thuringia, Slavonians in Franconia — facts which can be found in full in Zeuss *vv. Fränkische und Thüringische Slawen — (Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme).*

Saxony brings us down to the point with which the preceding paper concluded viz: the frontier of Bohemia. This was in the same category with Brandenburg. In Leipzig Slavonic was spoken A. D. 1327. In Lusatia it is spoken at the present moment. When were the hypothetical Germans of all these parts eliminated, or (if not eliminated) amalgamated with a population of intruders who displaced their language, not on one spot or on two, but every where?

If the Slavonians of the time of Charlemagne were indigenous to the western portion of their area, they were, *a fortiori*, indigenous to the eastern. At any rate, few who hold that the German populations of Bohemia, Mecklenburg, Luneburg, Altmark, Brandenburg, Saxony, Silesia, and Lusatia are recent, will doubt their being so in Pomerania.

In his Edition of the Germania of Tacitus the only Germans east of the Elbe, Saale and the Fichtel Gebirge, recognised by the present writer are certain intrusive Marcomanni; who (by hypothesis) derived from Thuringia, reached the Danube by way of the valley of Naab, and pressed eastward to some point unknown — but beyond the southern frontier of Moravia. Here they skirted the Slavonic populations of the north, and formed to their several areas the several Marches from which they took their name.

As far as we have gone hitherto we have gone in the direction of the doctrine that the Slavonians of Franconia, Thuringia, Saxony, Altmark, Luneburg, Mecklenburg, Holstein, and Brandenburg &c. were all old occupants of the districts in which they were found in the 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries; also that the present Czekhs of Bohemia and Moravia, the present Serbs of Lusatia and Brandenburg, the present Kassubs of Pomerania, and the present Slovaks of Hungary represent aboriginal populations. We now ask how far this was the case with the frontagers of North-eastern Italy, and the Slavonians of Carinthia and Carniola. The conclusion to which we arrive in respect to these will apply to those of Bosnia, Servia, and Dalmatia.

That the Carinthians and Carniolans were the descendants of the Carni of the Alpes Carnicæ would never have been doubted but for the following statements — "The Krobati who now oc-

"cupy the parts in the direction of Delmatia are derived from "the Unbaptized Krobati, the Krovati Aspri so-called; who "dwelt on the otherside of Turkey, and near France, contermi- "nous with the Unbaptized Slaves — *i. e.* the Serbi. The word "Krobati is explained by the dialect of the Slaves. It means "the possessors of a large country" — *Constantinus Porphyroge- neta — De Adm. Imp.* 31. *ed. Par. p.* 97.

Again — "But the Krobati dwelt then in the direction of Bagi- "vareia" (Bavaria) "where the Belokrobati are now. One tribe "(γενεὰ) separated. Five brothers led them. Clukas, and Lobelos, "and Kosentes, and Muklô, and Krobatos, and two sisters, Tuga "and Buga. These with their people came to Delmatia — The "other Krobati stayed about France, and are called Belokrobati, "*i. e.* Aspri Krobati, having their own leader. They are subject "to Otho the great king of France and Saxony. They continue "Unbaptized, intermarrying" (συμπενθερίας καὶ ἀγάπας ἔχοντες) "with the Turks" — *c.* 30. *p.* 95. — The statement that the Kroa- tians of Dalmatia came from the Asprocroatians is repeated. The evidence, however, lies in the preceding passages; upon which it is scarcely necessary to remark that *bel*=*white* in Slavonic, and *aspro*=*white* in Romaic.

So much for the Croatians. The evidence that the Servians were in the same category, is also Constantine's. — "It must be "understood that the Servians are from the Unbaptized Servians, "called also Aspri, beyond Turkey, near a place called Boiki, "near France — just like the Great Crobatia, also Unbaptized "and White. Thence, originally, came the Servians — *c.* 32. *p.* 99.

In the following passages the evidence improves — "The same "Krobati came as suppliants to the Emperor Heraclius, before "the Servians did the same, at the time of the inroads of the "Avars — By his order these same Krobati having conquered "the Avars, expelled them, occupied the country they occupied, "and do so now" — *c.* 31. *p.* 97.

Their country extended from the River Zentina to the frontier of Istria and, thence, to Tzentina and Chlebena in Servia. Their towns were Nona, Belogradon, Belitzein, Scordona, Chlebena, Stolpon, Tenen, Kori, Klaboca — (*c.* 31. *p.* 97. 98). Their country was divided into 11. *Supan-rics* (Ζουπανιας).

They extended themselves. From the Krobati "who came into "Dalmatia a portion detached themselves, and conquered the Illy- "rian country and Pannonia" (*c.* 30 *p.* 95).

The further notices of the Servians are of the same kind. Two brothers succeeded to the kingdom, of which one offered his men and services to Heraclius, who placed them at first in the Theme Thessalonica, where they grew homesick, crossed the Danube about Belgrade, repented, turned back, were placed

in Servia, in the parts occupied by the Avars, and, finally, were baptized. (*c.* 32. *p.* 99.)

It is clear that all this applies to the Slavonians of Croatia, Bosnia, Servia, and Slavonia—*i. e.* the triangle at the junction of the Save and Danube. It has no application to Istria, Carniola, Carinthia, and Styria. Have any writers so applied it? Some have, some have not. More than this, many who have never applied it argue just as if they had. Zeuss, especially stating that the Slavonic population of the parts in question was earlier than that of Croatia, still, makes it recent. Why? This will soon be seen. At present, it is enough to state that it is not by the *direct* application of the passage in Porphyrogeneta that the antiquity of the Slavonic character of the Carinthians, Carniolans, and Istrians is impugned.

The real reason lies in the fact of the two populations being alike in other respects. What is this worth? Something—perhaps, much. Which way, however, does it tell? That depends on circumstances. If the Croatians be recent, the Carinthians should be so too. But what if the evidence make the Carinthians old? Then, the recency of the Croatians is impugned. Now Zeuss (*vv. Alpenslawen, Carantani, and Creinarii*) distinctly shews that there were Slavonians in the present districts before the time of Heraclius — not much before, but still before. Why not much? "They came only a little before, inasmuch as Procopius "gives us nothing but the old names Carni, and Norici". But what if these were Slavonic?

The present meaning of the root *Carn-* is *March*, just as it is in U-*krain*. In a notice of the year A. D. 974 we find "quod *Carn*-"iola vocatur, et quod vulgo vocatur *Creina marcha*", the Slavonic word being translated into German. Such a fact, under ordinary circumstances would make the *Carn-* in Alpes *Carn*-icæ, a Slavonic gloss; as it almost certainly is. I do not, however, know the etymologist who has claimed it. Zeuss does not—though it is from his pages that I get the chief evidence of its being one.

Croatia, Bosnia, and Servia now come under the application of the Constantine text.

Let it pass for historical; notwithstanding the length of time between its author and the events which it records.

Let it pass for historical, notwithstanding the high probability of *Crobyzi*, a word used in Servia before the Christian æra, being the same as *Krobati*.

Let it pass for historical, notwithstanding the chances that it is only an inference from the presence of an allied population on both sides of Pannonia.

Let it pass for historical, notwithstanding the leadership of the five brothers (one the eponymus *Krobatos*) and the two sisters.

Let it do this, and then let us ask how it is to be interpreted. Widely or strictly? We see what stands against it viz: the existing conditions of three mountainous regions exhibiting the signs of being the occupancies of an aboriginal population as much as any countries on the face of the earth.

What then is the strict interpretation? Even this — that Heraclius introduced certain Croatians from the north into the occupancies of the dispossessed Avars apparently as military colonies. Does this mean that they were the first of their lineage? By no means. The late emperor of Russian planted Slavonic colonies of Servians in Slavonic Russia. Metal upon metal is false heraldry; but it does not follow that Slave upon Slave is bad ethnology.

With such a full realization of the insufficiency of the evidence which makes Bohemia, Carinthia, Servia &c. other than Slavonic *ab initio*, we may proceed to the ethnology of the parts to the west, and southwest — the Tyrol, Northern Italy, Switzerland, Bavaria, and Wurtemberg. In respect to these, we may either distribute them among the populations of the frontier, or imagine for them some fresh division of the population of Europe, once existent, but now extinct. We shall not, however, choose this latter alternative unless we forget the wholesome rule which forbids us to multiply causes unnecessarily.

Let us say, then, that the southern frontier of the division represented by the Slavonians of Carniola was originally prolonged until it touched that of the northernmost Italians. In like manner, let the Styrian and Bohemian Slaves extend till they meet the Kelts of Gaul. With this general expression I take leave of this part of the subject — a subject worked out in detail elsewhere (*Edition of Prichard's Eastern origin of the Celtic Nation, and The Germania of Tacitus with Ethnological Notes*, — *Native Races of the Russian Empire* &c.).

The *northern* and *eastern* frontiers of the Slavonians involve those of (1) Ugrians, (2) the Lithuanians.

In respect to the former, I think a case can be made out for continuing the *earliest* occupancy of the populations represented by the Liefs of Courland, and the Rahwas of Estonia to the Oder at least; perhaps further. This means along the coast. Their extent inland is a more complex question. The so called Fin hypothesis in its full form is regarded, by the present writer, as untenable. But between this and a vast extension of the Fin area beyond its present bounds there is a great difference. It is one thing to connect the Basks of Spain with the Khonds of India; another to bring the Estonians as far west as the Oder, or even as the Elbe. It is one thing to make an allied population occupant of Sweden, Spain, and Ireland; another to refer the oldest population of western Russia to the stock to which the eastern undeniably belongs.

This latter is a mere question of more or less. The other is a difference, not of kind, but of degree. With this distinction we may start from the most southern portion of the present Ugrian area; which is that of the Morduins in the Government of Penza. Or we may start from the most western which is that of the Liefs of Courland. What are the traces of Fin occupancy between these and the Vistula and Danube — the Vistula westward, the Danube on the South. How distinct are they? And of what kind? We cannot expect them to be either obvious or numerous. Say that they are the vestiges of a state of things that has passed away a thousand years, and we only come to the time of Nestor. Say that they are doubly so old, and we have only reached the days of Herodotus; in whose time there had been a sufficient amount of encroachment and displacement to fill the southern Governments of Russia with Scythians of Asiatic origin. The Britons were the occupants of Kent at the beginning of our æra. How faint are the traces of them. We must regulate, then, our expectations according to the conditions of the question. We must expect to find things just a little more Ugrian than aught else.

From that part of Russia which could, even a thousand years ago, exhibit an indigenous population we must subtract all those districts which were occupied by the Scythians. We do not know how much comes under this category. We only know that the Agathyrsi were in Hungary, and that they were, probably, intruders. We must substract the Governments of Kherson, Ekaterinoslav, and Taurida at the very least — much of each if not all. That this is not too much is evident from the expressed opinions of competent investigators. Francis Newman carries the Scythia of Herodotus as far as Volhynia, and, in Volhynia, there were Cumanian Turks as late as the 11th century. Say, however that the aborigines were not Fins. At any rate they were not the ancestors of the present Russians — and it is the original area of these that we are now considering. In the North there were Fins when Novorogod, and in the East Fins when Moscow, was founded. In Koursk, writes Haxthausen, there is a notable difference in the physiognomy of the inhabitants; the features being Fin rather than Slavonic.

I now notice the name of Roxolani. Prichard and, doubtless, others besides see in this a Fin gloss, the termination-*lani* being the termination-*lainen* in Suome*lainen*, Hame*lainen* and several other Fin words, *i. e.* a gentile termination. It does not follow from this that the people themselves were Fins. It only follows that they were in a Fin neigbourhood. Some one who spoke a language in which the form in *-lain-* was used to denote the name of a people was on their frontier, and this frontier must have been South of that of the Roxolani themselves — else how

did it come to the ears of the Greeks and Romans? If this were not the case, then was the name native, and the Roxolani were Ugrian. In either case we have a Fin gloss, and a Fin locality suggested by it. Now the country of the Roxolani either reached, or approached, the Danube.

In the account of Herodotus a population named *Neuri* occupied a marshy district at the back of the Scythian area; probably the marshes of Pinsk. This is, perhaps, a Fin gloss. The town of *Narym* in the Ostiak country takes its name from the marshes round it.

The Lithuanian language avoids the letter *f.*—using *p.* instead; sometimes *m.* The Greek φιλεω is *m*ylu in Lithuanic. The name, then, that a Fin locality would take in the mouth of a Lithuanian would not be *F*insk but *M*insk, or *P*insk, and these are the names we find on what I think was, at one time, the Finno-Lithuanic frontier.

I should add that the *Kour-* in *Kour*-sk seems to be the *Kour-* in *Kour*-land, the *Kor-* in *Kor*-alli (a Fin population of the Middle Ages), and the *Car-* in the eminently, and almost typically, Fin *Kar*elians.

This is not much in the way of evidence. Much or little, however, it is more than can be got for any other population. Much or little it is got at by a very cursory investigation. No special research has been instituted. No tumulus has been appealed to. No local dialect has been analysed. No ordnance map has been pored over. All this will, doubtless, be done in time, and if, when it has been done, no confirmation of the present doctrine be found, the propounder will reconsider it. If the evidence point elsewhere he will abandon it. At present he brings the early Fin frontier to Minsk and Pinsk.

There it touched that of the Lithuanians. To make these the most eastern members of the Sarmatian stock is, at the first view, to fly in the face of the testimony of their present position. They are, in one sense, the most western. The Germans of Prussia touch them on the side of Europe. Between them and the Fins of Asia, the vast Russian area of the Governments of Smolensko, Novogorod &c. intervene. Speaking laxly, one may say that all Russia lies beyond them. Nevertheless, it is with the Fins of Estonia that they are also in contact; whilst the explanation of the German and Russian contact is transparently clear. The Germans (as a matter of history) cut their way through whole masses of Slavonians in Pomerania, before they reached them; so displacing the Slavonians to the west of them. The Russians (again a matter of history) pressed up to them by a circuit from the south and west. The Lithuanians have kept their position—but one population has stretched beyond, and another has pres-

sed up to them. Their language is eminently akin to the Sanskrit. Their physiognomy is the most Fin of any thoroughly European population.

There were no Slavonians, *in situ*, to the East of the Lithuanic area; none originally. By encroachment and change of place there are, in later times, many. There are, as aforesaid, all the Russians of the present moment. The question, however, before us is the original area, the primordial *situs*.

The westward extension of the Lithuanians is a matter upon which I do not press the details. I think that the Vistula may have been to them and the Slavonians what the Rhine was to the Gauls and Germans. The main question is how far can we bring them south? What justifies us in making them reach the Carpathians? At present we find them in Livonia, Courland, East Prussia, Vilna, and Grodno; but further south than Grodno nowhere; nowhere, at least, with the definite characteristics of name and language. Every inch that is given them south of Grodno must have its proper evidence to support it.

The Gothini of Tacitus are the first population that we may make Lithuanic. What says Tacitus? They were not Germans; their language proved this. They were not Sarmatians. The Sarmatians imposed a tribute upon, as on men of another stock — *tributa ut alienigenis imponunt*. The Quadi did the same. If neither Germans nor Sarmatians what were they? Members of a stock now extinct? The rule against the unnecessary multiplication of causes forbids us to resort to this supposition. Do so once and we may always be doing it. Were they Fins? Say that they were, and what do we gain by it? We may as well prolong the Lithuania area from Grodno as the Fin from Pinsk. Nay, better. That Grodno is Lithuanian we *know*. That Pinsk was Fin we *infer*. Were they Scythians? We know of no Scythians beyond the Maros; so that the reasoning which told against the Fin hypothesis tells equally against the Turk. Beyond the Germans, the Slavonians, the Fins, the* Turks, and the Lithuanians we have nothing to choose from; and I submit that the *minimum* amount of assumption lies with the population last named.

Now comes the name of their Language. The Language of the Gothini was *Gallica* — Osos Pannonica, Gothinos *Gallica* arguit non esse Romanos. I have given reasons elsewhere (Germania of Tacitus with Ethnological notes) for translating Gallica Gallician, — not Gallic. Say, however, that the latter is the better translation; Gothini would still be the name of the people.

There is a country, then, of the Gothini sufficiently far

* The term *Turk* is used in its wide Ethnological sense, and includes the *Scythæ*.

south to be in contact with the Quadi and Sarmatæ—the Quadi in Moravia and Upper Hungary, the Sarmatæ in the parts between the Theiss and the Danube. Gallicia meets these conditions. It was a mining country. Gallicia is this. It was on the Upper Vistula—probably at its head-waters. At the *mouth* of the same river the name re-appears, in that of the *Goth*ones, *Gutt*ones, *Gyth*ones &c. of the Amber country. These were either the nearest neighbours of the Aestyii, or the Aestyii themselves under a name other than German—for Aestyii is an undoubted German gloss, just like *Est-* in *Est-*onia.

Are we justified in identifying these two populations on the strength of the name? No. What we *are* justified in doing, however, is this. We are justified in placing on the frontier of both a language in which the root *Goth-* was part of a national name.

At the beginning of the historical period these Gothones were the Lithaunians of East Prussia, and their neigbours called them *Guddon*. They were the congeners of those Lithuanians whose area, even now, extents as far south as Grodno.

It is easy to connect the Gothones with Grodno; but what connects Grodno with Gothinian Gallicia? What *can* connect it now? All is Polish or Russian. What are the proofs that it was not so from the beginning? The following — the populations between Grodno and the frontier of Gallicia, appear, for the first time in history in the 13th century; but not as Poles, nor yet as Russians, but as Lithuanians — "cum *Pruthenica* et *Lithuanica* lingua habens magna ex parte similitudinem et intelligentiam"—"lingua, ritu, religione, et moribus magnam habebat cum *Lithuanis*, *Pruthenis* et *Samogitis*" (the present Lithuanians of East Prussia) "conformitatem".

We cannot bring these quite down to Gallicia; and this is not to be wondered at. The first notice we have of them is very nearly the last as well. The narrative which gives us the preceding texts is the narrative of their subjugation and extinction.

What was the name of this people? I premise that we get it through a double medium, the Latin, and the Slavonic—the latter language always being greatly disguised in its adaptation to the former. The commonest form is Jaczwingi (Lat.) Jatwyazi (Slavonic); then (in documents) *Getuin*-zitæ, a word giving the root *Gothon-*. Finally, we have "Pollexiani *Getharum* seu Prussorum gens".

Such are the reasons for connecting the Gothini of the Marcomannic frontier with the Gothini of the Baltic, and also for making both (along with the connecting Jaczwingi) Lithuanians. This latter point, however, is unessential to the present investigation; which simply considers the area of the Slavonians. For the parts

north of the Carpathians, it was limited by a continuous line of *Gothini*, *Getuinzitæ*, and *Gothones*. Whatever those were they were not Slavonic.

Such is the sketch of the chief reasons for believing that originally the Vistula (there or thereabouts) was the boundary of the Slavonians on the North East; a belief confirmed by the phenomena of the languages spoken, at the present moment, beyond that river. They fall into few dialects; a fact which is *prima facie* evidence of recent introduction. The Polish branch shews itself in varieties and subvarieties on its western frontier; the Russian on its southern and south-eastern. The further they are found East and North, the newer they are.

I may add that I find no facts in the special ethnology of the early Poles, that complicate this view. On the contrary, the special facts, such as they are, are confirmatory rather than aught else of the western *origin* and the eastern *direction*, of a Polish line of encroachment, migration, occupancy, displacement, invasion, or conquest. Under the early kings of the blood of Piast (an individual wholly unhistoric), the locality for their exploits and occupancies is no part of the country about the present capital, Warsaw; but the district round Posen and Gnesen; this being the area to which the earliest legends attach themselves.

Where this is not the case, where the Duchy of Posen or Prussian Poland does not give us the earliest signs of Polish occupancy, the parts about Cracow do. At any rate, the legends lie in the west and south rather than in the east; on the Saxon or the Bohemian frontier rather than the Lithuanic.

The Slavonic area south of the Carpathians gives us a much more complex question — one, indeed, too complex to investigate it in all its bearings.

That there were both Slavonians and Lithuanians in Dacia, Lower Mœsia, Thrace, and, even, Macedon is nearly certain — and that early. Say that they were this at the beginning of the historical period. It will, by no means, make them aboriginal.

Such being the case I limit myself to the statement that, at the beginning of the historical period, the evidence and reasoning that connects the Thracians with the Getæ, the Getæ with the Daci, and the Daci with the Sarmatian stock in general is sufficient. Whether it makes them indigenous to their several areas is another question. It is also another question whether the relationship between them was so close as the current statements make it. These identify the Getæ and Daci. I imagine that they were (there or thereabouts) as different as the Bohemians and the Lithuanians — the Getic Lithuanians, and the Dacian (Daci = *Τζαχοι*) Czekhs; both, however being Sarmatian.

I also abstain from the details of a question of still greater

importance and interest viz: the extent to which a *third* language of the class which contains the Slavonian and Lithuanic may or may not have been spoken in the parts under notice. There was room for it in the parts to the South of the Fin, and the east of the Lithuanic, areas. There was room for it in the present Governments of Podolia, and Volhynia, to say nothing of large portions of the drainage of the Lower Danube. The language of such an area, if its structure coincided with its geographical position would be liker the Lithuanic and the most eastern branch of the Slavonic than any other Languages of the so-called Indo-European Stock. It would also be more Sarmatian than either German or Classical. Yet it would be both Classical and German also, on the strength of the term Indo-European. It would be the most Asiatic of the tongues so denominated; with some Ugrian affinities, and others with the languages in the direction of Armenia, and Persia. It would be a language, however, which would soon be obliterated; in as much as the parts upon which we place it were, at an early date, overrun by Scythians from the East, and Slavonians from the West. When we know Volhynia, it is Turk, and Polish, — anything but aboriginal. Such a language, however, might, in case the populations who spoke it had made early conquests elsewhere, be, still, preserved to our own times. Or it might have been, at a similarly early period, committed to writings; the works in which it was embodied having come down to us. If so, its relations to its congeners would be remarkable. *They* would only be known in a modern, *it* only in an ancient, form. Such being the case the original affinity might be disguised; especially if the transfer of the earlier language had been to some very distant and unlikely point.

I will now apply this hypothetical series of arguments. It has long been known that the ancient, sacred, and literary language of Northern India has its closest grammatical affinities in Europe. With none of the tongues of the neighbouring countries, with no form of the Tibetan of the Himalayas or the Burmese dialects of the north-east, with no Tamul dialect of the southern part of the Peninsula itself has it half such close resemblances as it has with the distant and disconnected Lithuanian.

As to the Lithuanian, it has, of course, its closest affinities with the Slavonic tongues of Russia, Bohemia, Poland, and Servia, as aforesaid. And when we go beyond the Sarmatian stock, and bring into the field of comparison the other tongues of Europe, the Latin, the Greek, the German, and the Keltic, we find that the Lithuanic is more or less connected with them.

Now, the botanist who, found in Asia, extended over a comparatively small area, a single species, belonging to a genus which covered two-thirds of Europe (except so far as he might

urge that everything came from the east, and so convert the specific question into an hypothesis as to the origin of vegetation in general) would pronounce the *genus* to be European. The zoologist, in a case of zoology, would do the same.

Mutatis mutandis, the logic of the philologue should be that of the naturalist. Yet it is not.

1. The area of Asiatic languages in Asia allied to the ancient Language of India, is smaller than the area of European languages allied to the Lithuanic; and —

2. The class or genus to which the two tongues equally belong, is represented in Asia by the Indian division only; whereas in Europe it falls into three divisions, each of, at least, equal value with the single Asiatic one.

Nevertheless, the so-called Indo-European languages are deduced from Asia.

I do not ask whether, as a matter of fact, this deduction is right or wrong. I only state, as a matter of philological history, that it is made, adding that the hypothesis which makes it is illegitimate. It rests on the assumption that it is easier to bring a population from India to Russia than to take one from Russia to India. In the case of the more extreme language of which it takes cognisance this postulate becomes still more inadmissible. It assumes, in the matter of the Keltic (for instance), that it is easier to bring the people of Galway from the Punjab, than the tribes of the Punjab from Eastern Europe. In short, it seems to be a generally received rule amongst investigators, that so long as we bring our migration from east to west we may let a very little evidence go a very long way; whereas, so soon as we reverse the process, and suppose a line from west to east, the converse becomes requisite, and a great deal of evidence is to go but a little way. The effect of this has been to create innumerable Asiatic hypotheses and few or no European ones. Russia may have been peopled from Persia, or Lithuania from Hindostan, or Greece from Asia, or any place west of a given meridian from any place east of it — but the converse, never. No one asks for proofs in the former case; or if he do, he is satisfied with a very scanty modicum: whereas, in the latter, the best authenticated statements undergo stringent scrutiny. Inferences fare worse. They are hardly allowed at all. It is all "theory and hypothesis" if we resort to them in cases from west to east; but it is no "theory" and no "hypothesis" when we follow the sun and move westwards.

Let the two lines be put on a level, and let ethnographical philology cease to be so one-sided as it is. Let the possibility of a Western origin of the Sanskrit language take its natural place as the member of an alternative hitherto ignored. I do not say what will follow in the way of historical detail. I only

say (in the present paper at least) that the logic of an important class of philological questions will be improved. As it stands at present, it is little more than a remarkable phenomenon in the pathology of the philological mind, a symptom of the morbid condition of the scientific imagination of learned men.

Turning westwards we now take up the Slovenians of Carinthia and Styria on their western frontier, not forgetting the southermost of the Czekhs of Bohemia. How far did the Slavonic area extend in the direction of Switzerland, Gaul, and Italy?

In the Tyrol we have such geographical names as Scharn-*itz*, Gsh*nitz*-thal, and *Vintsh*-gau; in the Vorarlberg, Ked-*nitz* and Windisch-*matrei*. Even where the names are less definitely Slavonic, the compound sibilant *tsh*, so predominant in Slavonic, so exceptional in German, is of frequent occurrence. This, perhaps, is little, yet is more than can be found in any country *known* to have been other than Slavonic.

Again — a Slavonic population in the Vorarlberg and Southern Bavaria best accounts for the name *Vind*-elicia.

If the Slavonians are aboriginal, and if the Czekhs are the same, the decisive evidence that, within the historical period, they have both receded is in favor of their respective areas having originally been greater than they are at present. Such being the case, we may bring them both further south and further west. How far? This is a question of minute detail, not to be answered off-hand. The rule of parsimony, however, by which we are forbidden to multiply stocks unnecessarily, carries them to the frontier of the Gauls in one direction, and the Italians on the other.

If so, there may have been Slavonians on the frontier of Liguria. More than this the Rhæti may have been Slavonic also. But many make the Etruscans Rhætian. Is it possible however, that even the Etruscans were Slavonic?

I know of numerous *opinions* against their being so. I know of no *facts*.

ON THE TERMS OF *GOTHI* AND *GETÆ*.

OBSERVATIONS LAID BEFORE THE ETHNOLOGICAL SECTION, AT THE MEETING OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE, HELD AT BIRMINGHAM 1849.

So far from the Gothi and Getæ being identical there is no reason to believe that any nation of Germany ever bore the former of these two names until it reached the country of the population designated by the latter. If so, the Goths were Gothic, just as certain Spaniards are Mexican and Peruvian; and just as certain Englishmen are Britons *i. e.* not at all.

The Goths of the Danube, etc. leave Germany as Grutungs and Thervings, become Marcomanni along the Bohemian and Moravian frontiers, Ostrogoths and Visigoths, on the Lower Danube (or the land of the Getæ), and Mœsogoths (from the locality in which they become Christian) in Mœsia.

What were the Goths of Scandinavia? *It is not I who am the* first by many scores of investigators to place all the numerous populations to which the possible modifications of the root *G—t* apply in the same category. I only deny that that category is German. Few separate the Jutes of Jutland, from the Goths of Gothland. Then there is the word *Vitæ;* which is to *Gut-*, as *Will*-iam is to *Gul*-ielmus, a form that was probably Lithuanic.

If *J+t*, as it occurs in the word *Jute*, be, really, the same as the *G+t* in *Got* or *Goth*, we have a reason in favour of *one* of the earlier Danish populations having been Lithuanic.

The four islands of Sealand, Laaland, Moen, and Falster formed the ancient *Vithesleth*. This division is of considerable import; since the true country of *Dan*, the eponymus of the *Danes*, was not Jutland, nor yet Skaane, nor yet Fyen. It was the Four Islands of the Vithesleth: — "Dan — rex primo super Sialandiam, Monam, Falstriam, et Lalandiam, cujus regnum dicebatur *Vithesleth*. Deinde super alias provincias et insulas et totum regnum." — Petri Olai Chron.

Regum Daniæ. Also, "Vidit autem Dan regionem suam, super quam regnavit, Jutiam, Fioniam, *Withesleth*, Scaniam quod esset bona." — Annal. Esrom. p. 224.

That the Swedes and Norwegians are the newest Scandinavians and that certain Ugrians were the oldest, is undoubted. But it by no means follows that the succession was simple. Between the first and last there may have been any amount of intercalations. Was this the case? My own opinion is, that the first encroachments upon the originally Ugrian area of Scandinavia were not from the south-west, but from the south-east, not from Hanover but from Prussia and Courland, not German but Lithuanic, and (as a practical proof of the inconvenience of the present nomenclature) although not German, *Gothic*.

Whether these encroachments were wholly Lithuanic, rather than Slavonic as well, is doubtful. When the archæology of Scandinavia is read aright, *i. e.* without a German prepossession, the evidence of a second population will become clear. This however, is a detail.

The Gothic historian Jornandes, deduces the Goths of the Danube first from the southern coasts of the Baltic, and ultimately from Scandinavia. I think, however, that whoever reads his notices will be satisfied that he has fallen into the same confusion in respect to the Germans of the Lower Danube and the Getæ whose country they settled in, as an English writer would do who should adapt the legends of Geoffroy of Monmouth respecting the British kings to the genealogies of Ecbert and Alfred or to the origin of the warriors under Hengist. The legends of the soil and the legends of its invaders have been mixed together.

Nor is such confusion unnatural. The real facts before the historian were remarkable. There were Goths on the Lower Danube, Germanic in blood, and known by the same name as the older inhabitants of the country. There were Gothones, or Guttones, in the Baltic, the essential part of whose name was *Goth-*; the *-n-* being, probably, and almost certainly, an inflexion.

Thirdly, there were Goths in Scandinavia, and Goths in an intermediate island of the Baltic. With such a series of *Goth*-lands, the single error of mistaking the old *Getic* legends for those of the more recent Germans (now called *Goths*), would easily engender others; and the most distant of the three Gothic areas would naturally pass for being the oldest also. Hence, the deduction of the Goths of the Danube from the Scandinavian Gothland.

ON THE JAPODES AND GEPIDÆ.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

JANUARY 15TH 1857.

Of the nations whose movements are connected with the decline and fall of the Roman empire, though several are more important than the *Gepidæ*, few are of a greater interest. This is because the question of their ethnological relations is more obscure than that of any other similar population of equal historical prominence. How far they were Goths rather than Vandals, or Vandals rather than Goths, how far they were neither one nor the other, has scarcely been investigated. Neither has their origin been determined. Nor have the details of their movements been ascertained. That the current account, as it stands in the pages of Jornandes Diaconus, is anything but unexceptionable, will be shown in the present paper. It is this account, however, which has been adopted by the majority of inquirers.

The results to which the present writer commits himself are widely different from those of his predecessors; he believes them, however, to be of the most ordinary and commonplace character. Why, then, have they not been attained long ago? Because certain statements, to a contrary effect, being taken up without a due amount of preliminary criticism, have directed the views of historians and ethnologists towards a wrong point.

These, however, for the present will be ignored, and nothing, in the first instance, will be attended to but the primary facts upon which the argument, in its simplest form, depends. These being adduced, the ordinary interpretation of them will be suggested; after which, the extent to which it is modified by the statements upon which the current doctrines are founded will be investigated.

If we turn to Strabo's account of the parts on the north-eastern side of the Adriatic, the occupancies of the nume-

rous tribes of the Roman province of Illyricum, we shall find that no slight prominence is given to the population called Ἰάποδες. They join the Carni. The Culpa (Κολαπις) flows through their land. They stretch along the coast to the river Tedanius; Senia is their chief town. The Moentini, the Avendeatæ, the Auripini, are their chief tribes. Vendos (Avendo) is one of their occupancies. Such are the notices of Strabo, Ptolemy, Appian, and Pliny; Pliny's form of the word being Japydes.

The Iapodes, then, or Japydes, of the authors in question, are neither an obscure nor an inconsiderable nation. They extend along the sea-coast of the Adriatic. They occupy the valley of the Culpa. They are Illyrian, but conterminous with Pannonia.

As Pliny seems to have taken his name from Strabo, the authors just quoted may all be called Greek. With the latest of them we lose the forms Ἰάποδες or Japydes.

As the Roman empire declines and its writers become less and less classical, their geographical records become less systematic and more fragmentary; and it is not till we get to the times of Probus and Maximian that we find any name approaching Ἰάποδες. Probus, however, plants a colony of *Gepidæ* within the empire (*Vopiscus, Vit. Pub.* c. 18). The Tervings also fight against the Vandals and Gipedes (*Mamertinus in Genethl. Max.* c. 17). Sidonius makes the fierce Gepida (*Gepida trux*) a portion of the army of Attila. Finally, we have the Gepidæ, the Lombards, and the Avars, as the three most prominent populations of the sixth century.

The Gepid locality in the fifth century is the parts about Sirmium and Singidunum — Alt Schabacz and Belgrade — within the limits of Pannonia, and beyond those of Illyricum, *i. e.* a little to the north of the occupancy of the Iapodes and Japydes of Strabo and Pliny.

There is, then, a little difference in name between Japydes and Gepidæ, and a little difference in locality between the Gepids and Iapodes. I ask, however, whether this is sufficient to raise any doubt as to the identity of the two words? Whether the populations they denoted were the same is another matter. I only submit that, word for word, *Japyd* and *Gepid* are one. Yet they have never been considered so. On the contrary, the obscure history of the Japydes is generally made to end with Ptolemy; the more brilliant one of the Gepidæ to begin with Vopiscus. This may be seen in Gibbon, in Zeuss, or in any author whatever who notices either, or both, of the two populations.

There is a reason for this; it does not, however, lie in

the difference of name. Wider ones than this are overlooked by even the most cautious of investigators. Indeed, the acknowledged and known varieties of the word Gepidæ itself, are far more divergent from each other than *Gepidæ* is from *Japydes*. Thus Gypides, *Γήπαιδες*, *Γετίπαιδες*, are all admitted varieties, — varieties that no one has objected to.

Nor yet does the reason for thus ignoring the connexion between *Gepidæ* and *Japydes* lie in the difference of their respective localities. For a period of conquests and invasions, the intrusion of a population from the north of Illyricum to the south of Pannonia is a mere trifle in the eye of the ordinary historian, who generally moves large nations from one extremity of Europe to another as freely as a chess-player moves a queen or castle on a chess-board. In fact, some change, both of name and place, is to be expected. The name that Strabo, for instance, would get through an Illyrian, Vopiscus or Sidonius would get through a Gothic, and Procopius through (probably) an Avar, authority — directly or indirectly.

The true reason for the agreement in question having been ignored, lies in the great change which had taken place in the political relations of the populations, not only of Illyricum and Pannonia, but of all parts of the Roman empire. The Japydes are merely details in the conquest of Illyricum and Dalmatia; the Gepid history, on the contrary, is connected with that of two populations eminently foreign and intrusive on the soil of Pannonia, — the Avars and the Lombards. How easy, then, to make the Gepidæ foreign and intrusive also. Rarely mentioned, except in connexion with the exotic Goth, the exotic Vandal, the exotic Avar, and the still more exotic Lombard, the Gepid becomes, in the eyes of the historian, exotic also.

This error is by no means modern. It dates from the reign of Justinian; and occurs in the writings of such seeming authorities as Procopius and Jornandes. With many scholars this may appear conclusive against our doctrine; since Procopius and Jornandes may reasonably be considered as competent and sufficient witnesses, not only of their foreign origin, but also of their Gothic affinities. Let us, however, examine their statements. Procopius writes, that "the Gothic nations are many, the greatest being the Goths, Vandals, Visigoths, and Gepaides. They were originally called the Sauromatæ and Melanchlæni. Some call them the Getic nations. They differ in name, but in nothing else. They are all whiteskinned and yellow-haired, tall and good-looking, of the same creed, for they are all Arians. Their

language is one, called Gothic." This, though clear, is far from unexceptionable (*B. Vand.* i. 2). Their common language may have been no older than their common Arianism.

Again, the Sciri and Alani are especially stated to be Goths, which neither of them were, — the Alans, not even in the eyes of such claimants for Germany as Grimm and Zeuss.

Jornandes writes: "Quomodo vero Getæ Gepidæque sint parentes si quæris, paucis absolvam. Meminisse debes, me initio de Scanziæ insulæ gremio Gothos dixisse egressos cum Berich suo rege, tribus tantum navibus vectos ad citerioris Oceani ripam; quarum trium una navis, ut assolet, tardius vecta, nomen genti fertur dedisse; nam lingua eorum pigra *Gepanta* dicitur. Hinc factum est, ut paullatim et corrupte nomen eis ex convitio nasceretur. Gepidæ namque sine dubio ex Gothorum prosapia ducunt originem: sed quia, ut dixi, *Gepanta* pigrum aliquid tardumque signat, pro gratuito convitio Gepidarum nomen exortum est, quod nec ipsum, credo, falsissimum. Sunt enim tardioris ingenii, graviores corporum velocitate. Hi ergo Gepidæ tacti invidia, dudum spreta provincia, commanebant in insula Visclæ amnis vadis circumacta, quam pro patrio sermone dicebant Gepidojos. Nunc eam, ut fertur, insulam gens Vividaria incolit, ipsis ad meliores terras meantibus. Qui Vividarii ex diversis nationibus acsi in unum asylum collecti sunt, et gentem fecisse noscuntur."

I submit that this account is anything but historical. Be it so. It may, however, be the expression of a real Gothic affinity on the part of the Gepids, though wrong in its details. Even this is doubtful. That it may indicate a political alliance, that it may indicate a partial assumption of a Gothic nationality, I, by no means, deny. I only deny that it vitiates the doctrine that *Japydes* and *Gepidæ* are, according to the common-sense interpretation of them, the same word.

The present is no place for exhibiting in full the reasons for considering Jornandes to be a very worthless writer, a writer whose legends (if we may call them so) concerning the Goths, are only Gothic in the way that the fables of Geoffrey of Monmouth are English, *i. e.* tales belonging to a country which the Goths took possession of, rather than tales concerning the invaders themselves

It is suggested then, that the statements of Procopius and Jornandes being ignored, the common-sense interpretation of the geographical and etymological relations of the *Iapodes*

and *Gepidæ* — word for word, and place for place — be allowed to take its course; the Gepidæ being looked upon as Illyrians, whatever may be the import of that word; occupants, at least, of the country of the Iapodes, and probably their descendants.

Thus far the criticism of the present paper goes towards separating the Gepidæ from the stock with which they are generally connected, viz. the German, — also from any emigrants from the parts north of the Danube, *e. g.* Poland, Prussia, Scandinavia, and the like. So far from doing anything of this kind, it makes them indigenous to the parts to the north-east of the head of the Adriatic. As such, what were they? Strabo makes them a mixed nation — Kelt and Illyrian.

What is Illyrian? Either Albanian or Slavonic; it being Illyria where the populations represented by the Dalmatians of Dalmatia come in contact with the populations represented by the Skipetar of Albania.

The remaining object of the present paper is to raise two fresh questions: —

1. The first connects itself with the early history of Italy, and asks how far migrations from the eastern side of the Adriatic may have modified the original population of Italy. Something — perhaps much — in this way is suggested by Niebuhr; suggested, if not absolutely stated. The Chaonian name, as well as other geographical and ethnological relations, is shown to be common to both sides of the Gulf. Can the class of facts indicated hereby be enlarged? The name, which is, perhaps, the most important, is that of the *Calabri*. These are, writes Strabo, a "people of the Dardaniatæ, in whose land is an ancient city" (p. 316). Word for word this is *Calabri* — whatever the geographical and ethnological relations may be. Without being exactly Iapodes, these Calabri are in the Iapod neighbourhood.

Without being identical, the name of the Italian Iapyges (which was to all intents and purposes another name for Calabri) is closely akin to Iapodes; so that, in Italy, we have Calabri called also Iapyges, and, in Illyria, Iapodes near a population called Calabri.

More than this, Niebuhr (see Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography, v. *Japygia*) suggests that Apulia may be Iapygia, word for word. The writer of the article just quoted demurs to his. At the same time the change from *l* to *d* is, at the present moment, a South Italian characteristic. The Sicilian for *bello* was *beddo*. On the other hand, this is a change in the wrong direction; still it is a change of the kind required.

The evidence that there was a foreign population in Calabria is satisfactory — the most definite fact being the statement that the Sallentines were partly Cretans, associated with Locrians and *Illyrians*. (See *Calabria*.)

Again, this district, wherein the legends concerning Diomed prevailed, was also the district of the Daunii, whom Festus (v. *Daunia*) connects with *Illyria*.

I suggest that, if the Calabri were Galabri, the Iapyges were Iapodes. Without enlarging upon the views that the definite recognition of Illyrian elements in Southern Italy suggests, we proceed to the next division of our subject.

2. Is there any connexion between the names *Iapod-es* and *Iapet-us?* The answer to this is to be found in the exposition of the criticism requisite for such problems. Special evidence there is none.

The first doctrine that presents itself to either the ethnologist or the historian of fiction, in connexion with the name Iapetus, is that it is the name of some *eponymus* — a name like Hellen, or Æolus, Ion, or Dorus. But this is opposed by the fact that no nation of any great historical prominence bears such a designation. Doubtless, if the Thracians, the Indians, the Ægyptians, &c. had been named *Iapeti*, the doctrine in question would have taken firm root, and that at once. But such is not the case.

May it not, however, have been borne by an obscure population? The name *Greek* was so born. So, at first, was the name *Hellen*. So, probably, the names to which we owe the wide and comprehensive terms *Europe*, *Asia*, *Africa*, and others. Admit then that it may have belonged to an obscure population; — next, admitting this, what name so like as that of the Iapodes? Of all known names (unless an exception be made in favour of the *-gypt* in *Æ-gypt*) it must be this or none. No other has any resemblance at all.

Who were on the confines of the non-Hellenic area? Iapyges on the west; Iapodes on the north-west. The suggested area was not beyond the limits of the Greek mythos. It was the area of the tales about Diomed. It was the area of the tales about Antenor. It was but a little to the north of the land of the *Lapithæ*, whose name, in its latter two-thirds, is *I-apod*. It ran in the direction of Orphic and Bacchic Thrace to the north. It ran in the direction of Cyclopæan and Lestrygonian Sicily to the west. It was on the borders of that *terra incognita* which so often supplies eponymi to unknown and mysterious generations.

Say that this suggestion prove true, and we have the first of the term *Iapodes* in Homer and Hesiod, the last in the

German genealogies of the geography of Jornandes and in the Traveller's Song — unless, indeed, the modern name *Schabacz* be word for word, *Gepid*. In the Traveller's Song we get the word in a German form, *Gifþe* or *Gifþas*. The *Gifþas* are mentioned in conjunction with the *Wends*.

In Jornandes we get *Gapt* as the head of the Gothic genealogies: — Horum ergo (ut ipsi suis fabulis ferunt) primus fuit *Gapt*, qui genuit Halmal; Halmal vero genuit Augis, &c. Now *Gapt* here may stand for the eponymus of the *Gepidæ*, or it may stand for *Japhet*, the son of Noah. More than one of the old German pedigrees begins with what is called a Gothic legend, and ends with the book of Genesis.

To conclude: the bearing of the criticism upon the ethnology of the populations which took part in the destruction of the Roman empire, is suggestive. There are several of them in the same category with the Gepidæ.

Mutatis mutandis: every point in the previous criticism, which applies to the Gepidæ and Iapydes, applies to the *Rugi* and *Rhæti*. Up to a certain period we have, in writers more or less classical, notices of a country called *Rhætia*, and a population called *Rhæti*. For a shorter period subsequent to this, we hear nothing, or next to nothing, of any one.

Thirdly, in the writers of the 5th and 6th centuries, when the creed begins to be Christian and the authorities German, we find the *Rugi* of a *Rugi-land*, — *Rugi-land*, or the land of the *Rugi*, being neither more nor less than the ancient province of *Rhætia*.

Name, then, for name, and place for place, the agreement is sufficiently close to engender the expectation that the *Rhæti* will be treated as the *Rugi*, under a classical, the *Rugi* as the *Rhæti*, under a German, designation. Yet this is not the case. And why? Because when the Rugi become prominent in history, it is the recent, foreign, and intrusive Goths and Huns with whom they are chiefly associated. Add to this, that there existed in Northern Germany a population actually called *Rugii*.

For all this, however, *Rugiland* is *Rhætia*, and *Rhætia* is *Rugiland*, — name for name and place for place. So, probably, is the modern Slavonic term *Raczy*.

VIII.

ETHNOLOGICA.

ON THE SUBJECTIVITY OF CERTAIN CLASSES IN ETHNOLOGY.

FROM

THE PHILOSOPHICAL MAGAZINE FOR MAY 1853.

To the investigator who believes in the unity of the human species, whether he be a proper ethnologist, or a zoologist in the more current signification of the term, the phænomena exhibited by the numerous families of mankind supply ninetenths of the *data* for that part of natural history which deals with *varieties* as subordinate to, and as different from, *species*. The history of domestic animals in comprehensiveness and complexity yields to the history of the domesticator. Compare upon this point such a work as G. Cuvier's on the Races of Dogs, with Dr. Prichard's Natural History of Man. The mere difference in bulk of volume is a rough measure of the difference in the magnitude of the subjects. Even if the dog were as ubiquitous as man, and consequently as much exposed to the influence of latitude, and altitude, there would still be wanting to the evolution of canine varieties the manifold and multiform influences of civilization. The name of these is *legion*; whilst the extent to which they rival the more material agencies of climate and nutrition is getting, day by day, more generally admitted by the best and most competent inquirers. Forms as extreme as any that can be found within the pale of the same species are to be found within that of the species *Homo*. Transitions as gradual as those between any varieties elsewhere are also to be found. In summing up the value of the *data* supplied by man towards the *natural history of varieties*, it may be said

that they are those of a species which has its geographical distribution everywhere and a moral as well as a physical series of characteristics. Surely, if the question under notice be a question that must be studied indructively, Man gives us the field for our induction.

Before I come to the special point of the present notice and to the explanation of its somewhat enigmatical heading, I must further define the sort of doctrine embodied in what I have called the belief of the unity of our species. I do not call the upholder of the developmental doctrine a believer of this kind. His views — whether right or wrong — are at variance with the current ideas attached to the word species. Neither do I identify with the recognition of single species the hypothesis of a multiplicity of protoplasts, *so long as they are distributed over several geographical centres.* The essential element to the idea of a single species is a single geographical centre. For this, the simplest form of the protoplast community is a single pair.

All this is mere definition and illustration. The doctrine itself may be either right or wrong. I pass no opinion upon it. I assume it for the present; since I wish to criticize certain terms and doctrines which have grown up under the belief in it, and to show, that, from one point of view, they are faulty, from another, legitimate.

It will simplify the question if we lay out of our account altogether the *islands* of the earth's surface, limiting ourselves to the populations of the continent. Here the area is *continuous*, and we cannot but suppose the stream of population by which its several portions were occupied to have been *continuous* also. In this case a population spreads from a centre like circles on a still piece of water. Now, if so, *all changes must have been gradual, and all extreme forms must have passed into each other by means of a series of transitional ones.*

It is clear that such forms, when submitted to arrangement and classification, will not come out in any definite and wellmarked groups, like the groups that constitute what is currently called species. On the contrary, they will run into each other, with equivocal points of contact, and indistinct lines of demarcation; so that discrimination will be difficult, if not impracticable. If practicable, however, it will be effected by having recourse to certain typical forms, around which such as approximate most closely can most accurately and conveniently be grouped. When this is done, the more distant outliers will be distributed over the debateable ground of an equivocal frontier. To recapitulate: varieties as oppo-

sed to species imply transitional forms, whilst transitional forms preclude definite lines of demarcation.

Yet what is the actual classification of the varieties of mankind, and what is the current nomenclature? To say the least, it is very like that of the species of a genus. Blumenbach's Mongolians, Blumenbach's Caucasians, Blumenbach's Æthiopians, — where do we find the patent evidence that these are the names of varieties rather than species? Nowhere. The practical proof of a clear consciousness on the part of a writer that he is classifying *varieties* rather than *species,* is the care he takes to guard his reader against mistaking the one for the other, and the attention he bestows on the transition from one type to another. Who has ever spent much ethnology on this? So far from learned men having done so, they have introduced a new and lax term — *race.* This means something which is neither a variety nor yet a species — a *tertium quid.* In what way it differs from the other denomination has yet to be shown.

Now if it be believed (and this belief is assumed) that the varieties of mankind are *varieties of a species* only, and if it cannot be denied that the nomenclature and classification of ethnologists is the nomenclature and classification of men investigating the *species of a genus,* what is to be done? Are species to be admitted, or is the nomenclature to be abandoned? The present remarks are made with the view of showing that the adoption of either alternative would be inconsiderate, and that the existing nomenclature, even when founded upon the assumption of broad and trenchant lines of demarcation between varieties which (*ex vi termini*) ought to graduate into each other, is far from being indefensible.

Man conquers man, and occupant displaces occupant on the earth's surface. By this means forms and varieties which once existed become extinct. The more this extinction takes place, the greater is the obliteration of those transitional and intermediate forms which connect extreme types; and the greater this obliteration, the stronger the lines of demarcation between geographically contiguous families. Hence a variational modification of a group of individuals simulates a difference of species; forms which were once wide apart being brought into juxtaposition by means of the annihilation of the intervening transitions. Hence what we of the nineteenth century, — ethnologists, politicians, naturalists, and the like — behold in the way of groups, classes, tribes, families, or what not, is beholden to a great extent under the guise of *species*; although it may not be so in reality, and although it might not have been so had we been witnes-

ses to that earlier condition of things when one variety graduated into another and the integrity of the chain of likeness was intact. This explains the term *subjectivity*. A group is sharply defined simply because we know it in its state of definitude; a state of definitude which has been brought about by the displacement and obliteration of transitional forms.

The geographical distribution of the different ethnological divisions supplies a full and sufficient confirmation of this view. I say "full and sufficient," because it cannot be said that *all* our groups are subjective, *all* brought about by displacement and obliteration. Some are due to simple isolation; and this is the reason why the question was simplified by the omission of all the *insular* populations. As a general rule, however, the *more definite the class, the greater the displacement;* displacement which we sometimes know to have taken place on historical evidence, and displacement which we sometimes have to infer. In thus inferring it, the language is the chief test. The greater the area over which it is spoken with but little or no variation of dialect, the more recent the extension of the population that speaks it. Such, at least, is the *primâ facie* view.

A brief sketch of the chief details that thus verify the position of the text is all that can now be given.

1. The populations of South-eastern Asia, Mongol in physiognomy and monosyllabic in speech, have always been considered to form a large and natural, though not always a primary, group. Two-thirds of its area, and the whole of its frontier north of the Himalayas, is formed by the Chinese and Tibetans alone. These differ considerably from each other, but more from the Turks, Mongols, and Tongusians around. In the mountainous parts of the Assam frontier and the Burmese empire, each valley has its separate dialect. Yet these graduate into each other.

2. Central Asia and Siberia are occupied by four great groups, the populations allied to the Turk, the populations allied to the Mongol, the populations allied to the Mantshu, and the populations allied to the Finns. These are pretty definitely distinguished from each other, as well as from the Chinese and Tibetans. They cover a vast area, an area, which, either from history or inference, we are certain is far wider at present than it was originally. They have encroached on each and all of the populations around, till they meet with families equally encroaching in the direction of China and Tibet. This it is that makes the families which are called *Turanian* and *Monosyllabic* natural groups. They are cut off, more or less, from each other and from other

populations by the displacement of groups originally more or less transitional. The typical populations of the centre spread themselves at the expense of the sub-typicals of the periphery until the extremes meet.

2. The circumpolar populations supply similar illustrations. Beginning with Scandinavia, the Lap stands in remarkable contrast with the Norwegian of Norway, and the Swede of Sweden. Why is this? Because the Northman represents a population originally German, — a population which, however much it may have graduated into the type of the most southern congeners of the Lap, is now brought into contact with a very different member of that stock.

4. This phænomenon repeats itself in the arctic portions of America, where the Algonkin and Loucheux Indians (Indians of the true American type) come in geographical contact, and in physiological contrast, with the Eskimo. Consequently along the Loucheux and Algonkin frontiers the line of demarcation between the Eskimo and the Red Indian (currently so-called) is abrupt and trenchant. Elsewhere, as along the coast of the Pacific, the two classes of population graduate into each other.

5. The African family is eminently isolated. It is, however, just along the point of contact between Africa and Asia that the displacements have been at a *maximum*. The three vast families of the Berbers, the Arabs and the Persians, cannot but have obliterated something (perhaps *much*) in the way of transition.

6. The Bushmen and Hottentots are other instances of extreme contrast, *i. e.* when compared with the Amakosah Caffres. Yet the contrast is only at its height in those parts where the proof of Caffre encroachment is clearest. In the parts east of Wallfisch Bay — traversed by Mr. Galton — the lines of difference are much less striking.

Such are some of the instances that illustrate what may be called the "subjectivity of ethnological groups," — a term which greatly helps to reconcile two apparently conflicting habits, viz. that of thinking with the advocates of the unity of the human species, and employing the nomenclature of their opponents.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF PHILOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF GROUPS,

WITH

PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE LANGUAGES OF THE INDO-EUROPEAN CLASS.

READ BEFORE THE ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

28TH FEBRUARY 1849.

In respect to the languages of the Indo-European class, it is considered that the most important questions connected with their systematic arrangement, and viewed with reference to the extent to which they engage the attention of the present writers of philology, are the three following: —

1. *The question of the Fundamental Elements of certain Languages.* — The particular example of an investigation of this kind is to be found in the discussion concerning the extent to which it is a language akin to the Sanskrit, or a language akin to the Tamul, which forms the basis of certain dialects of *middle* and even *northern* India. In this is involved the question as to the relative value of grammatical and glossarial coincidences.

2. *The question of the Independent or Subordinate Character of certain Groups.* — Under this head comes the investigation, as to whether the Slavonic and Lithuanic tongues form separate groups, in the way that the Slavonic and Gothic tongues form separate groups, or whether they are each members of some higher group. The same inquiry applies to the languages (real or supposed) derived from the Zend, and the languages (real or supposed) derived from the Sanskrit.

3. *The question of Extension and Addition.* — It is to this that the forthcoming observations are limited.

Taking as the centre of a group, those forms of speach which have been recognised as Indo-European (or Indo-Germanic), from the first recognition of the group itself, we find the languages derived from the ancient Sanskrit, the languages derived from the ancient Persian, the languages of Greece and Rome, the Slavonic and Lithuanic languages, and the languages of the Gothic stock; Scandinavian, as well as Germanic. The affinity between any two of these groups has currently been considered to represent the affinity between them all at large.

The way in which the class under which these divisions were contained, as subordinate groups, has received either *addition* or *extension*, is a point of philological history, which can only be briefly noticed; previous to which a difference of meaning between the words *addition* and *extension* should be explained.

To draw an illustration from the common ties of relationship, as between man and man, it is clear that a family may be enlarged in two ways.

a. A brother, or a cousin, may be discovered, of which the existence was previously unknown. Herein the family is enlarged, or increased, by the *real* addition of a new member, in a recognised degree of relationship.

b. A degree of relationship previously unrecognised may be recognised, *i. e.*, a family wherein it was previously considered that a second-cousinship was as much as could be admitted within its pale, may incorporate third, fourth, or fifth cousins. Here the family is enlarged, or increased, by a *verbal* extension of the term.

Now it is believed that the distinction between increase by the way of real addition, and increase by the way of verbal extension, has not been sufficiently attended to. Yet, that it should be more closely attended to, is evident; since, in mistaking a verbal increase for a real one, the whole end and aim of classification is overlooked.

I. *The Celtic.* — The publication of Dr. Prichard's Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations, in 1831, supplied philologists with the most definite addition that has, perhaps, yet been made to ethnographical philology.

Ever since then, the Celtic has been considered to be Indo-European. Indeed its position in the same group with the Iranian, Classical, Slavono-Lithuanic, and Gothic tongues, supplied the reason for substituting the term Indo-*European* for the previous one Indo-*Germanic*.

2. Since the fixation of the Celtic, it has been considered that the Armenian is Indo-European. Perhaps the wellknown

affinity between the Armenian and Phrygian languages directed philologists to a comparison between the Armenian and Greek. Müller, in his Dorians, points out the inflexion of the Armenian verb-substantive.

3. Since the fixation of the Celtic, it has been considered that the old Etruscan is Indo-European.

4. Since the fixation of the Celtic, it has been considered that the Albanian is Indo-European.

5. Since the fixation of the Celtic, Indo-European elements have been indicated in the Malay.

6. Since the fixation of the Celtic, Indo-European elements have been indicated in the Laplandic.

7. Since the fixation of the Celtic, it has been considered that the Ossetic is Indo-European.

8. Since the consideration of the Ossetic as Indo-European, the Georgian has been considered as Indo-European likewise.

Now the criticism of the theory which makes the Georgian to be Indo-European, is closely connected with the criticism of the theory which makes the Ossetic and the Malay to be Polynesian; and this the writer reserves for a separate paper. All that he does at present is to express his opinion, that if any of the seven last-named languages are Indo-European, they are Indo-European not by real addition, in the way of recognised relationship, but by a verbal extension of the power of the term Indo-European. He also believes that this is the view which is taken, more or less consciously or unconsciously, by the different authors of the different classifications themselves. If he be wrong in this notion, he is at issue with them as to a matter of fact; since, admitting *some* affinity on the part of the languages in question, he denies that it is that affinity which connects the Greek and German, the Latin and Lithuanian.

On the other hand, if he rightly imagine that they are considered as Indo-European on the strength of some other affinity, wider and more distant than that which connects the Greek with the German, or the Latin with the Lithuanic, he regrets that such an extension of a term should have been made without an exposition of the principles that suggested it, or the facts by which it is supported; principles and facts which, when examined by himself, have convinced him that most of the later movements in this department of ethnographical philology, have been movements in the wrong direction.

There are two principles upon which languages may be classified.

According to the first, we take two or more languages as we find them, ascertain certain of their characteristics, and then inquire how far these characteristics coincide.

Two or more languages thus taken agree in having a large per-centage of words in common, or a large percentage of grammatical inflexions; in which case they would agree in certain *positive* characters. On the other hand, two or more such languages agree in the *negative* fact of having a small and scanty vocabulary, and an inflexional system equally limited; whilst, again, the scantiness of inflexion may arise from one of two causes. It may arise from the fact of inflexions having never been developed at all, or it may arise from inflexions having been lost subsequent to a full development of the same. In all such cases as these, the principle of classification would be founded upon the extent to which languages agreed or differed in certain external characteristics; and it would be the principle upon which the mineralogist classifies minerals. It is not worth while to recommend the adoption of the particular term *mineralogical*, although mineralogy is the science that best illustrates the distinction. It is sufficient to state, that in the principle here indicated, there is no notion of *descent*.

It is well known that in ethnographical philology (indeed in ethnology at large) the mineralogical principle is not recognised; and that the principle that *is* recognised is what may be called the *historical* principle. Languages are arranged in the same class, not because they agree in having a copious grammar or scanty grammar, but because they are descended (or are supposed to be descended) from some common stock; whilst similarity of grammatical structure, and glossarial identity are recognised as elements of classification only so far as they are *evidence* of such community of origin. Just as two brothers will always be two brothers, notwithstanding differences of stature, feature, and disposition, so will two languages which have parted from the common stock within the same decennium, be more closely allied to each other, at any time and at all times, than two languages separated within the same century; and two languages separated within the same century, will always be more cognate than two within the same millennium. This will be the case irrespective of any amount of subsequent similarity or dissimilarity.

Indeed, for the purposes of ethnology, the phenomena of subsequent similarity or dissimilarity are of subordinate importance. Why they are so, is involved in the question as to the rate of change in language. Of two tongues separa-

ted at the same time from a common stock, one may change rapidly, the other slowly; and, hence, a dissimilar physiognomy at the end of a given period. If the English of Australia were to change rapidly in one direction, and the English of America in another, great as would be the difference resulting from such changes, their ethnological relation would be the same. They would still have the same affiliation with the same mother-tongue, dating from nearly the same epoch.

In ethnological philology, as in natural history, *descent* is the paramount fact; and without asking how far the value thus given to it is liable to be refined on, we leave it, in each science, as we find it, until some future investigator shall have shewn that either for a pair of animals *not* descended from a common stock, or for a pair of languages *not* originating from the same mother-tongue, a greater number of general propositions can be predicated than is the case with the two most dissimilar instances of either an animal or a language derived from a common origin.

Languages are allied just in proportion as they were separated from the same language at the same epoch.

The same epoch. — The word *epoch* is an equivocal word, and it is used designedly because it is so. Its two meanings require to be indicated, and, then, it will be necessary to ask which of them is to be adopted here.

The *epoch*, as a period in the duration of a language, may be simply *chronological*, or it may *be philological*, properly so called.

The space of ten, twenty, a hundred, or a thousand years, is a strictly chronological epoch. The first fifty years after the Norman conquest is an epoch in the history of the English language; so is the reign of Henry the Third, or the Protectorship of Oliver Cromwell. A definite period of this sort is an epoch in language, just as the term of twenty or thirty years is an epoch in the life of a man.

On the other hand, a period that, chronologically speaking, is indefinite, may be an epoch. The interval between one change and an other, whether long or short, is an epoch. The duration of English like the English of Chaucer, is an epoch in the history of the English language; and so is the duration of English like the English of the Bible translation. For such epochs there are no fixed periods. With a language that changes rapidly they are short; with a language that changes slowly they are long.

Now, in which of these two meanings should the word be used in ethnographical philology? The answer to the question is supplied by the circumstances of the case, rather than

by any abstract propriety. We cannot give it the first meaning, even if we wish to do so. To say in what year of the duration of a common mother-tongue the Greek separated from the stock that was common to it and to the Latin is an impossibility; indeed, if it could be answered at once, it would be a question of simple history, not an inference from ethnology: since ethnology, with its palæontological reasoning from effect to cause, speaks only where history, with its direct testimony, is silent.

We cannot, then, in ethnological reasoning, get at the precise year in which any one or two languages separated from a common stock, so as to say that *this separated so long before the other*.

The *order*, however, of separation we *can* get at; since we can *infer* it from the condition of the mother-tongue at the time of such separation; this condition being denoted by the condition of the derived language.

Hence the philological epoch is an approximation to the chronological epoch, and as it is the nearest approximation that can possibly be attained, it is practically identical with it, so that the enunciation of the principle at which we wish to arrive may change its wording, and now stand as follows, — *Languages are allied, just in proportion as they were separated from the same language in the same stage.*

Now, if there be a certain number of well-marked forms (say *three*) of development, and if the one of these coincide with an early period in the history of language, another with a later one, and the third with a period later still, we have three epochs wherein we may fix the date of the separation of the different languages from their different parent-stocks; and these epochs are natural, just in proportion as the forms that characterise them are natural.

Again, if each epoch fall into minor and subordinate periods, characterised by the changes and modifications of the then generally characteristic forms, we have the basis for subordinate groups and a more minute classification.

It is not saying too much to say that all this is no hypothesis, but a reality. There *are* real distinctions of characteristic forms corresponding with real stages of development; and the number of these is three; besides which, one, at least, of the three great stages falls into divisions and subdivisions.

1. The stage anterior to the evolution of inflexion. — Here each word has but one form, and relation is expressed by mere juxtaposition, with or without the superaddition of a change of accent. The tendencies of this stage are to com-

bine words in the way of composition, but not to go further. Every word retains, throughout, its separate substantive character, and has a meaning independent of its juxtaposition with the words with which it combines.

2. The stage wherein inflexions are developed. — Here, words originally separate, and afterwards placed in juxtaposition with others, as elements of a compound term, so far change in form, or so far lose their separate signification, as to pass for adjuncts, either prefixed or postfixed to the main word. What was once a word is now the part of a word, and what was once Composition is now Derivation, certain sorts of Derivation being called Inflexions, and certain Inflexions being called Declensions or Conjugations, as the case may be.

3. The stage wherein inflexions become lost, and are replaced by separate words. — Here case-endings, like the *i* in *patr-i*, are replaced by prepositions (in some cases by postpositions), like the *to* in *to father;* and personal endings, like the *o* in *voc-o*, are replaced by pronouns, like the *I* in *I call.*

Of the *first* of these stages, the Chinese is the language which affords the most typical specimen that can be found in the present *late* date of languages — *late*, considering that we are looking for a sample of its earliest forms.

Of the *last* of these stages the English of the year 1849 affords the most typical specimen that can be found in the present *early* date of language — *early*, considering that we are looking for a sample of its latest forms.

Of the second of these stages we must take two languages as the samples.

1. *The Greek.* — Here we have the inflexional character in its most perfect form; *i. e.*, the existence, as separate words, of those sounds and syllables that form inflexions is at its maximum of concealment; *i. e.*, their amalgamation with the primary word (the essence of inflexion) is most perfect.

2. *The Circassian, Coptic, or Turkish.* — In one of these (it is difficult to say which) the existence as separate words of those sounds and syllables which form inflexions, is at its *minimum* of concealment; *i. e.*, their amalgamation with the primary word (the essence of inflexion) being most imperfect.

This classification is, necessarily, liable to an element of confusion common to all classifications where the evidence is not exactly of the sort required by the nature of the question. The nature of the question here dealt with requires the evidence of the historical kind, *i. e.*, direct testimony The only evidence, however, we can get at is indirect and inferential. This engenders the following difficulty. The

newest language of (say) the languages of the secondary formation may be nearer in chronology, to the oldest language of the third, than to the first formed language of its own class. Indeed, unless we assume the suspension of all change for long epochs, and that those coincide with the periods at which certain languages are given off from their parent stocks, such *must* be the case.

Now, although this is a difficulty, it is no greater difficulty than the geologists must put up with. With them also there are the phenomena of transition, and such phenomena engender unavoidable complications. They do so, however, without overthrowing the principles of their classification.

The position of a language in respect to its stage of development is one thing, — the position in respect to its allied tongues another.

Two languages may be in the same stage (and, *as such*, agree), yet be very distant from each other in respect to affiliation or affinity. Stage for stage the French is more closely connected with the English, than the English with the Mœso-Gothic. In the way of affiliation, the converse is the case.

Languages are allied (or, what is the same thing, bear evidence of their alliance), according to the number of forms that they have in common; since (subject to one exception) these common forms must have been taken from the common mother-tongue.

Two languages separated from the common mother-tongue, subsequent to the evolution of (*say*) a form for the dative case, are more allied than two languages similarly separated anterior to such an evolution.

Subject to one exception. This means, that it is possible that two languages may appear under certain circumstances more allied than they really are, and *vice versâ*.

They may appear more allied than they really are, when, after separating from the common mother-tongue during the ante-inflexional stage, they develop their inflexions on the same principle, although *independently*. This case is more possible than proved.

They may appear less allied than they really are, when, although separated from the common mother-tongue after the evolution of a considerable amount of inflexion, each taking with it those inflexions, the one may retain them, whilst the other loses them *in toto*. This case also is more possible than proved.

Each of these cases involves a complex question in phi-

lology: — the one the phenomena connected with the *rate of change*; the other the *uniformity of independent processes*.

These questions are likely to affect future researches more than they have affected the researches hitherto established. Another question has affected the researches hitherto established more than it is likely to affect future ones. This is the question as to the *fundamental unity*, *or non-unity of language*. Upon this the present writer has expressed an opinion elsewhere. At present he suggests that the more the general unity of the human language is admitted, the clearer will be the way for those who work at the details of the different affiliations. As long as it is an open question, whether one class of languages be *wholly* unconnected with others, *any* connection engenders an inclination to arrange it under the group previously recognised. I believe that this determined the position of the Celtic in the Indo-European group. I have great doubts whether if *some* affinity had been recognised from the beginning, it would even have stood where it now does. The question, when Dr. Prichard undertook his investigations, was not so much whether the Celtic was in the exact ratio to any or all of the then recognised European languages in which they were to each other, but whether it was in any relation at all. This being proved, it fell into the class at once.

The present writer believes that the Celtic tongues were separated from their mother-tongue at a comparatively early period of the second stage; *i. e.*, when but few inflexions had been evolved; whilst the Classic, Gothic, Lithuano-Slavonic (Sarmatian), and Indo-Persian (Iranian) were separated at comparatively late periods of the same stage, *i. e.*, when many inflexions had been evolved.

Hence he believes that, in order to admit the Celtic, the meaning of the term Indo-European was extended.

Regretting this (at the same time admitting that the Celtic tongue is more Indo-European than any thing else), he believes that it is too late to go back to the older and more restricted use of the term; and suggests (as the next best change), the propriety of considering the Indo-European class as divided into two divisions, the older containing the Celtic, the newer containing the Iranian, Classical, Sarmatian, and Gothic tongues. All further extensions of the term he believes to be prejudicial to future philology; believing also that all supposed additions to the Indo-European class *have* (with the exception, perhaps, of the Armenian) involved such farther extension.

TRACES OF A BILINGUAL TOWN IN ENGLAND.

READ AT THE

MEETING OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE 1853.

It is well-known that the termination *-by* as the name of a village or town is a sign of Danish occupancy. At the present time it means *town* in Scandinavia; and Christiania or Copenhagen is called *By*, or *Byen*, = *the town, capital*, or metropolis. The English form is *-ton*. When an Angle said New*ton*, a Dane said New*by*. The distribution of the forms in *-by* has already commanded much attention; so that it is not the intention of the present writer to say much about it.

Along, however, with this form go others; *e. g.*

The English	*Ship*	becomes in Danish	*Skip*	as in	*Skipton*
—	*Fish*	—	*Fisk*	—	*Fiskerton*
—	*Worm*	—	*Orm*	—	*Ormsby*
—	*Church*	—	*Kirk*	—	*Ormskirk*

&c. &c.

In like manner the Roman *castra* becomes —

In English *chester* or *cester*, in Danish *caster* and *caistor*. Contrast the forms Tad*caster*, Lan*caster* &c. with *Chester*, or Bi*cester* and this difference becomes apparent.

Now the river Ouse in the parts about Wansford separates the counties of Huntingdon and Northampton — in the former of which no place ending in *-by* is to be found, and all the *castra* are *chester*; as Godman*chester*. In Northamptonshire, on the other hand, the Danish forms in *-by* are common, and the *castra* are *caistor*, or *caster*. All the Danish is on one side. Nothing is Danish on the other. The river has every appearance of having formed a frontier. On it lay the Roman station of Durobrivis — with, probably, *castra* on each side. At any rate, there are, at the present moment, two villages wherein that term appears. On the Huntingdon side is the village of *Chester*ton (English). On the Northampton side is that of *Caistor* (Danish).

ON THE ETHNOLOGICAL POSITION OF CERTAIN TRIBES ON THE GARROW HILLS.

*READ AT THE

MEETING OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE HELD AT YORK 1844.

The affinities of the Garrow language, a language which Klaproth in his Asia Polyglotta leaves unplaced, are with the Tibetan.

The bearings of this will be found in the next notice.

NOTE (1859).

This was written before I had seen Brown's Tables — wherein the affinity is virtually, though not directly affirmed.

ON THE TRANSITION BETWEEN THE TIBETAN AND INDIAN FAMILIES IN RESPECT TO CONFORMATION.

BRITISH ASSOCIATION—BIRMINGHAM 1849.

The remarks of Mr. Hodgson on the Kooch, Bodo, and Dhimal, along with some of Dr. Bird's on the monosyllabic affinities of the Tamulian languages have an important bearing on this question. So have the accounts of the Chepang and Garo tribes. The phenomena are those of transition.

We have a practical instance of this in the doctrine laid down by Mr. Hodgson in his valuable monograph. In this, he makes the Bodo a Tamulian *i. e.* a member of the same family with the hill-tribes of India and the Dekhan; meaning thereby the aborigines of India, contrasted with the populations to which he ascribes the Sanskrit language and the Hindu physiognomy. In the Tamulian form there is "a somewhat lozenge "contour, caused by the large cheek-bones" — "a broader flatter "face" — "eyes less evenly crossing the face in their line "of picture" — "beard deficient" — "with regard to the pe- "culiar races of the latter" (*i. e.* the Tamulians) "it can only "be safely said that the mountaineers exhibit the Mongolian "type of mankind more distinctly than the lowlanders, and "that they have, in general, a paler yellower hue than the "latter, amongst whom there are some (individuals at least) "who are nearly as black as negroes." — The Bodo are scarce- "ly darker than the mountaineers above them — whom "they resemble — only with all the physiognomical characte- "ristics softened down. — The Kols have a similar cast of "face."

This is the evidence of a competent observer to the fact of the Bodo &c. being, more or less, what is called Mongol; all the more valuable because he had not, then, recognized their language as monosyllabic. Meanwhile he never separ-

ates them from the Kols &c. but always connects the two. In other words, he gives us so much evidence to the fact of the Kols &c. being, more or less, Mongol also. But the Kols are the aborigines of India; whilst the Bodo are Tibetan.

NOTE (1859).

Recent researches have a tendency to make the Kols less Tamul and more Tibetan than they were held to be in 1849.

ON THE AFFINITIES OF THE LANGUAGES OF CAUCASUS WITH THE MONOSYLLABIC LANGUAGES.

READ AT THE

MEETING OF THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION AT CAMBRIDGE 1845.

Taking the samples of the Georgian, Lesgian, Mizhdzhedzhi, and Circassian classes as we find them in the Asia Polyglotta and comparing them with the specimens of the monosyllabic languages in the same work, in Brown's Tables, and in Leyden's paper on the Indo-Chinese Languages, we find the following coincidences. *

English, sky
1. Circassian, *whapch*, *wuafe*
2. Aka, *aupa*
Khamti, *fa*

English, sky
1. Absné, *kaukh*
Altekesek, *hak*
2. Akush, *kaka*
Burmese, *kydukkhe*

English, sky
1. Tshetshentsh, *tulak*
2. Koreng, *talo*
Khoibu, *thullung*

English, sun
1. Georgian, *mse*
Mingrelian, *bsha*
Suanic, *mizh*
2. Kuan-chua, *zhi*
Sianlo, *suu*

English, fire
1. Absné, *mza*
Circassian, *mafa*
2. Khamti, *fai*
Siam, *fai*
Aka, *umma*
Aber, *eme*
Burmese, *mi*
Karyen, *me*
Manipur, *mai*
Songphu, *mai*
Kapwi, &c., *mai*

English, day
1. Tshetshentsh, *dini*
Ingúsh, *den*
Kasikumuk, *kini*
2. Koreng, *nin*
Jili, *tana*
Singpho, *sini*

* In the Asiatic Transactions of Bengal and the Asiatic Researches. — Figure 1. denotes the Caucasian, Figure 2. monosyllabic forms of speech. This list was first *published* in 1850, in my Varieties of Man — *pp* 123—128.

English, day
1. Andi, *thyal*
2. Garo, *salo*

English, moon
1. Georgian, *twai* = *month*
Suanic, *twai*
2. Moitay, *ta*

English, star
1. Kasikumuk, *zuka*
2. Garo, *asake*
Jili, *sakan*
Singpho, *sagan*

English, hill
1. Kasikumuk, *suntu*
2. Chinese, *shan*

English, earth
1. Absné, *tshullah*
Altekesek, *tzula*
2. Kapwi, *talai*
Khoibu, *thalai*

English, earth
1. Andi, *zkhur*
2. Mishimi, *tari*

English, earth
1. Dido, *tshedo*
2. Koreng, *kadi*

English, snow
1. Lesgian, *asu*
Circassian, *uas*
Abassian, *asse*
2. Chinese, *siwe*

English, salt
1. Lesgian *(3), *zam*
2. Chinese, *yan*

English, salt
1. Kabutsh, *tshea*
Dido, *zio*
Kasikumuk, *psu*
Akush, *dze*
2. Tibetan, *tsha*

English, dust
1. Tshetshentsh, *tshen*
2. Chinese *tshin*

English, sand
1. Avar, *tshimig*
2. Tibetan, *bydzoma*

English, sand
1. Circassian, *pshakhoh*
2. Chinese, *sha*

English, leaf
1. Tshetshentsh, *ga*
Ingush, *ga*
2. Chinese, *ye*

English, tree
1. Mizjeji, *che*
Circassian, *dzeg*
2. Chinese, *shu*

English, stone
1. Andi, *hinzo*
2. Siamese, *hin*

English, sea
1. Georgian, *sgwa*
2. Chinese, *shuy* = *water*
Tibet, *çi* = *do*
Môn, *zhe* = *do*
Ava, *te* = *do*

English, river
1. Anzukh, *or kyare*
Avar, *hor*, *khor*
2. Champhung, *urai*

English, river
1. Abassian, *aji*
2. Tibetan, *tshavo*

English, river
1. Altekesek, *sedu*
Absné *dzedu*
2. Songphu, *duidai*

English, water
1. Kasikumuk, *sin*
Akush, *shen*
Kubitsh, *tzun*, *sin*
2. Singpho, *ntsin*

* This means in three dialects.

Jili, *mchin*
Manipur, *ising*

English, water
1. Absné, *dzeh*
2. Songphu, *dui*
Kapwi, *tui*
Tankhul, *tu*

English, water
1. Mizjeji, *chi*
2. Garo, *chi*

English, rain
1. Andi, *za*
Ingush, *du*
Abassian, *kua*
2. Chinese, *yu*

English, summer
1. Tushi, *chko*
Mizjeji, *achke*
2. Chinese, *chia*

English, winter
1. Anzukh, *tlin*
Andi, *klinu*
Kasikumuk, *kintul*
Akush, *chani*
Absné, *gene*
2. Tibetan, *r gun*
Chinese, *tung*

English, cow
1. Circassian, *bsa*
2. Tibetan, *r shu*

English, dog
1. Avar, *choi*
Andi, *choi*
Dido, *gwai*
Kubitsh, *koy*
Circassian, *khhah*
2. Chinese, *keu*
Tibetan, *kyi*

English, horse
1. Lesgian, *tshu*
Circassian, *tshe*, *shu*
2. Tibetan, *r dda*

English, bird
1. Avar, *hedo*
2. Tankhul, *ata*

English, bird
1. Andi, *purtie*
2. Abor, *pettang*
Aka, *put'ah*

English, fish
1. Avar, *tshua*
Circassian, *bbzheh*
2. Khamti, *pa*
Siamese, *pla*
Aka, *ngay*
Abor, *engo*
Burmese, *nga*
Karyen, *nga*
Singpho, *nga*
Songphu, *kha*
Mishimi, *ta*
Maram, *khai*
Luhuppa, *khai*
Tankhul, *khi*
Anam, *khi*

English, flesh
1. Kabutsh, *kho*
Abassian, *zheh*
2. Chinese, *shou*
Tibetan, *zhsha*

English, egg
1. Tshetshentsh, *khua*
2. Khamti, *khai*
Siamese, *khai*

English, egg
1. Kabutsh, *tshemuza*
2. Mishimi, *mtiumaie*

English, egg
1. Akush, *dukhi*
2. Garo, *to'ka*

English, son
1. Mizjeji, *ua*, *woe*
2. Tibetan, *bu*

English, hair
1. Kasikumuk, *tshara*

2. Jili, *kara*
Singpho, *kara*

English, hair
1. Avar, *sab*
Anzukh, *sab*
Tshari, *sab*
2. Burmese, *shaben*
Manipur, *sam*
Songpho (6), *sam*

English, hair
1. Tshetshentsh, *kazeresh*
2. Karyen, *khosu*
Tankhul, *kosen*

English, head
1. Georgian, *tavi*
Lazic, *ti*
Suanic, *tchum*
2. Chinese, *teu*, *seu*
Anam, *tu đu*
Ava, *kang* (5)

English, head
1. Andi, *mier*, *maar*
2. Assam, *mur*

English, head
1. Absné, *kah*, *aka*
Altekesek, *zeka*
2. Karen, *kho*
Manipur, *kok*
Tankhul, *akao*

English, mouth
1. Lesgian, *kall*
2. Chinese, *keu*
Anamese, *kau*
Tibetan, *ka*

English, mouth
1. Tushi, *bak*
2. Teina, *pak*

English, mouth
1. Georgian, *piri*
Mingrelian, *pidehi*
Suanic, *pil*
2. Ava, *parat* (4)

English, mouth
1. Kubitsh, *mole*
2. Khoibu, *mur*
Maring, *mur*

English, mouth
1. Andi, *kol*, *tkol*
Lesgian (3), *kaal*
2. Manipur, *chil*

English, eye
1. Andi, *puni*
2. Chinese, *yan*

English, ear
1. Avar, *een*, *ain*, *en*
Anzukh, *in*
Tshari, *een*, *ein*
Andi, *kanka*, *andika*
2. Burmese, *na*
Karen, *naku*
Singpho, *na*
Songphu, *anhukon*
Kapwi, *kana*
Koreng, *kon*
Maram, *inkon*
Champhung, *khunu*
Luhuppa, *khana*
Tankhul, *akhana*
Koibu, *khana*

English, tooth
1. Lesgian (3), *sibi*
Avar, *zavi*
Circassian, *dzeh*
2. Tibetan, *so*
Chinese, *tshi*

English, tongue
1. Circassian, *bbse*
Absné, *ibs*
2. Tibetan, *rdzhe*
Chinese, *shi*

English, foot
1. Kasikumuk, *dzhan*
2. Khamti, *tin*

English, foot
1. Mizjeji (3), *kog*, *koeg*

2. Manipur, *khong*
Tankhul, *akho*

English, foot
1. Andi, *tsheka*
Kubitsh, *tag*
Jili, *takkhyai*
2. Garo, *jachok*

English, foot
1. Georgian, *pechi*
2. Maplu, *pokà = leg*

English, finger
1. Mingrelian, *kiti*
Moitay, *khoit = hand*
2. Play, *kozu = do*

English, hand
1. Georgian, *chéli*
Lazic, *ieh*
Mingrelian, *ché*
Suanic, *shi*
2. Chinese, *sheu*

English. hand
1. Andi, *katshu*
Kabutsh, *koda*
2. Khoibu, *khut*
Manipur, *khut*

English, blood
1. Absné, *tsha*, *sha*
Tshetshentsh, *zi*
Ingús, *zi*
2. Singpho, *sai*
Songpho, *zyai*
Kapwi, *the*
Maram, *azyi*
Champhung, *azi*
Luhuppa, *ashi*
Tankhul, *asu*

English, blood
1. Dido, *é*
2. Manipur, *i*
Koibu, *hi*
Maring, *hi*

English, blood
1. Tshetshentsh, *yioh*
Circassian, *tlih*
2. Chinese, *chue*

English. skin
1. Circassian, *ffeh*
2. Chinese, *pi*

English, skin
1. Dido, *bik*
2. Tibetan, *shbagsbba*

English, bone
1. Tshetshentsh, *dyackt*
Ingúsh, *tekhh*
Akúsh, *likka*
Tshari, *rekka*
2. Khamti, *nuk*
Siamese, *kraduk*

English, great
1. Georgian, *didi*
Mingrelian, *didi*
2. Canton, *ta*
Kuan-chua, *ta*, *da*
Tonkin, *drai*
Cochin-chinese, *dai*
Tibet, *çe*
Ava, *kyi* (5)
Play, *du*
Teina, *to*

English, bad
1. Mingrelian, *moglach*
Suanic, *choya*
2. Chinese, *go gok*
Môn, *kah*
Ava, *makaung* (4)
— *gye* (2)

English, warm
1. Ingush, *tau*
2. Tibetan, *dzho*

English, blue
1. Mizjeji (3), *siene*
2. Chinese, *zing*
Tibetan, *swongbba*

English, yellow
1. Circassian, *khozh*

2. Abassian, *kha*
Chinese, *chuang*

English, green
1. Avar, *ursheria*
Anzukh, *ordjin*
Ingush, *send*
2. Tibetan, *shjanggu*

English, below
1. Georgian, *kwewrt*, *kwerno*
2. Ava, *haukma*
Yo, *auk*
Passuko, *hoko*
Kolaun, *akoa*

English, one
1. Lesgian, *zo*
Akush, *za*
Andi, *sew*
Dido, *zis*
Kasikumuk, *zabá*
Mizjeji, *tza*
Abassian, *seka*
2. Tibetan; *dzig*

English, three
1. Georgian, *sami*
Lazic, *jum*
Mingrelian, *sami*
Suanic, *semi*
2. Canton Chinese, *sam*
Kuanchua, *san*
Tonkin, *tam*
Tibetan, *sum*
Môn, *sum*
Ava, *thaum*
Siam, *sam*

English, four
1. Abassian, *pshi ba*
2. Tibetan, *bshi*
Chinese, *szu*

English, five
1. Georgian, *chuthi*
Lazic, *chut*
Mingrelian, *chuthi*
Suanic, *wochu'si*
2. Ava, *yadu*

English, six
1. Tshetshentsh, *yatsh*
Ingush, *yatsh*
Tushi, *itsh*
2. Tibetan, *dzhug*

English, nine
1. Circassian, *bgu*
2. Tibetan, *rgu*
Chinese, *kieu*

English, ten
1. Circassian, *pshe*
Abassian, *zheba*
2. Tibetan, *bdzhu*
Chinese, *shi*

ADDENDA (1859).

The limited amount of the *data* must be borne in mind. As has been stated, no vocabularies beyond those of the foer works enumerated were used. Had the comparison been moru extended, the evidence of the Tibetan affinities of the languages under notice would have been stronger. That this would have been the case has since been proved.

In 1849, just before the publication of my Varieties of Man, I found from my friend Mr. Norris that, upon *grammatical* grounds,

he had come to the same conclusion. A reference to the, then, recently published contributions of Rosen satisfied me that this was the case. The following is an abstract of his exposition of the structure of (1) the Iron, and (2) the Circassian.

(1)

IRON.

The Declension of Substantives is as follows;

	Singular.	*Plural.*
Nom.	fid *(father)*	fid-t^{s}-a
Gen.	fid-i	fid-t^{s}-i
Dat.	fid-én	fid-t^{s}-am
Abl.	fid-éi	fid-t^{s}-éi.
Nom.	moi *(husband)*	moi-t^{s}-a
Gen.	moi-i	moi-t^{s}-i
Dat.	moi-én	moi-t^{s}-am
Abl.	moi-éi	moi-t^{s}-éi.

The Comparative Degree is formed by the addition of *-dar;* as *chorz=good*, *chorz-dar=better.*

The pronouns of the two first persons are as follows;

1. *Az = I.* Defective in the oblique cases. *Man* or ma, defective.

2. *Di =* Thou. Defective in the nominative singular.

	Sing.	*Plural.*
Nom.	—	mach
Gen.	man-i	mach-i
Dat.	man-an	mach-én
Accus.	man	mach
Abl.	man-éi	mach-éi.
Nom.	di	si-mach
Gen.	daw-i *	si-mach-i
Dat.	daw-on	si-mach-én
Accus.	daw	si-mach
Abl.	daw-éi	si-mach-éi.

The signs of the persons of the verbs are *-in*, *-is*, *-i; -am tu^{s}*, *-in^{s} ; e. g.*

* *Or* dachi.

qus-*in* = aud-*io*	qus-*am* = aud-*imus*
qus-*is* = aud-*is*	qus-*uť* = aud-*itis*
qus-*i* = aud-*it*	qus-*inc̆* = aud-*iunt*.

The addition of the sound of *t* *helps* to form the Irôn preterite. I say *helps*, because if we compare the form *s-ko-*t-*on* = *I made*, with the root *kan*, or the form *fé-qus-*t-*on* = *I heard*, with the root *qus*, we see, at once, that the addition of *t* is only a *part* of an inflection.

Beyond this, the tenses become complicated; and that because they are evidently formed by the agglutination of separate words; the so-called imperfect being undoubtedly formed by affixing the preterite form of the word *to make*. The perfect and future seem to be similarly formed, dele from the auxiliary = *be*; as may be collected from the following paradigms.

1.

Plural — Present, st-am, st-ut, i-st-i = *sumus, estis, sunt*.
Singular — Preterite, u-t-an, u-t-as, u-d-i = *fui, fuisti, fuit*.
Singular — Future, u-gín-an, u-gín-as, u-gén-i = *ero, eris, erit*.
Imperative fau = *esto*.

2.

Root, k̆an = *make*.
Preterite, = s-k̆o-t-on,* s-k̆o-t-ai, s-k̆o-t-a = *feci, fecisti, fecit*.

3.

Root, kus = *hear*.

INDICATIVE.

	Sing.	*Plural.*
Present,	1. qus-*in*	qus-*am*.
	2. qus-*is*	qus-*uť*
	3. qus-*i*	qus-*inc̆*.
Imperfect,	1. qus-*ga-k̆o-t-on*	qus-*ga-k̆o-t-am*
	2. qus-*ga-k̆o-t-ai*	qus-*ga-k̆o-t-ať*
	3. qus-*ga-k̆o-t-a*	qus-*ga-k̆o-t-oi*
Perfect,	1. fé-*qus-t-on*	*fé-qus-t-am*
	2. fé-*qus-t-ai*	*fé-qus-t-ať*
	3. fé-*qus-t-a*	*fé-qus-t-oi*
Future,	1. bai-*qus-ǵin-an*	bai-*qus-ǵi-stam*
	2. bai-*qus-ǵin-as*	bai-*qus-ǵi-stuť*
	3. bai-*qus-ǵén-i*	bai-*qus-ǵi-sti*

* Or fa-ko-t-on, &c.

CONJUNCTIVE.

	Sing.	*Plural.*
Present,	1. qus-*on*	qus-*am*
	2. qus-*ai*	qus-*aṭ*
	3. qus-*ai*	qus-*oi*
Imperfect,	1. qus-*ga-kʿan-on*	qus-*ga-kʿan-am*
	2. qus-*ga-kʿan-ai*	qus-*ga-kʿan-aṭ*
	3. qus-*ga-kʿan-a*	qus-*ga-kʿan-oi*

IMPERATIVE.

1. —	bai-*qus-am*
2. bai-*qus*	bai-*qus-uṭ*
3. bai-*qus-a*	bai-*qus-oi*

INFINITIVE, qus-*in*.

Participles, qus-*ag*, qus-*gond*, qus-*in-ag*.

(2)

CIRCASSIAN.

In the Absné dialect *ab* = *father*, *ácĕ* = *horse*; *ab ácĕ* = *father's horse*, (verbally, *father horse*). Here position does the work of an inflection.

The use of prepositions is as limited as that of inflections, *sara s-ab ácĕ isʿap I my-father horse give*, or *giving am; abna amusʿw izbit* = *wood bear see-did* = *I saw a bear in the wood; awinĕ wi asʿwkĕ* = (in) *house two doors; ácĕ sisʿlit* = (on) *horse mount I-did.*

Hence, declension begins with the formation of the plural number. This consists in the addition of the syllable *kʿwa*.

Acĕ = *horse;*	*ácĕ-kʿwa* = *horses.*
Atsla = *tree;*	*astla-kʿwa* = *trees.*
Awinĕ = *house;*	*awinĕ-kʿwa* = *houses.*

In the pronouns there is as little inflection as in the substantives and adjectives, *i. e.* there are no forms corresponding to *mihi*, *nobis*, &c.

1. When the pronoun signifies possession, it takes an inseparable form, is incorporated with the substantive that agrees with it, and is *s-* for the first, *w-* for the second, and *i-*for the third, person singular. Then for the plural it s *h-* for the first person, *sʿ-* for the second, *r-* for the third: *ab* = father;

S-ab = *my father;* *h-ab* = *our father.*
W-ab = *thy father;* *s'-ab* = *your father.*
T-ab = *his (her) father;* *r-ab* = *their father.*

2. When the pronoun is governed by a verb, it is similarly incorporated.

3. Hence, the only inseparable form of the personal pronoun isto be found when it governs the verb. In this case the forms are:

Sa-ra = I *Ha-ra* = we
Wa-ra = thou *S'a-ru* = ye
Ui = he *U-bar'* = they.

In *sa-ra*, *wa-ra*, *ha-ra*, *s'a-ra*, the *-ra* is non radical. The word *u-bar'* is a compound.

The ordinal = *first* is *achani*. This seems formed from *aka* = *one*.

The ordinal = *second* is *agi*. This seems unconnected with the word *wi-* = *two*; just as in English, *second* has no etymological connection with *two*.

The remaining ordinals are formed, by affixing *-nto*, (and (in some case) prefixing *-a*; as

Cardinals.	*Ordinals.*
3, Chi-*ba**	*A*-chi-*nto*
4, P's'i-*ba*	*A*-p's'i-*nto*
5, Chu-*ba*	*A*-chu-*tno*
6, F-*ba*	F-*into*
7, Bis'-*ba*	Bs-*into*
8, Aa-*ba*	*A*-a-*nto*
9, S'-*ba*	S'b-*into*
10, S'wa-*ba*	Sw-*ento*.

In the Absné verbs the distinction of time is the only distinction denoted by any approach to the character of an inflection; and here the change has so thoroughly the appearance of having been effected by the addition of some separate and independent words, that it is doubtful whether any of the following forms can be considered as true inflections.

Root, C'wis'l = *ride*
1. *Present*, C'wis'l-*ap* = *I ride* † = *equito.*
2. *Present*, C'wis'l-*oit* = *I am riding.*

* Non-radical. † Or, *am in the habit of riding.*

Imperfect,	C'wis̆l-*an*	= *equitabam.*
Perfect,	C'wis̆l-*it*	= *equitavi.*
Plusquamperfect,	C'wis̆l-*chén*	= *equitaveram.*
Future,	C'wis̆l-*as̆t*	= *equitabo.*

The person and number is shown by the pronoun. And here must be noticed a complication. The pronoun appears in two forms: —

1st. In full, *sara*, *wara* &c.

2nd. As an inseparable prefix; the radical letter being prefixed and incorporated with the verb. It cannot, however, be said that this is a true inflexion.

1.

Sing. 1.	*sara s*-c'wisl-*oit*	= *I ride*
2.	*wara u*-c'wisl-*oit*	= *thou ridest*
3.	*ui i*-c'wisl-*oit*	= *he rides.*

2.

Plur. 1.	*hara ha*-c'wisl-*oit*	= *we ride*
2.	*s̆ara s̆*-c'wisl-*oit*	= *ye ride*
3.	*ubart r*-c'wisl-*oit*	= *they ride*

In respect to the name of the class under notice I suggested in 1850 the term Dioscurian from the ancient Dioscurias. There it was that the chief commerce between the Greeks and Romans, and the natives of the Caucasian range took place. According to Pliny, it was carried on by thirty interpreters, so numerous were the languages. The great multiplicity of mutually unintelligible tongues is still one of the characteristics of the parts in question. To have used the word *Caucasian* would have been correct, but inconvenient. It is already *mis*-applied in another sense, *i. e.*, for the sake of denoting the so-called Caucasian race, consisting, or said to consist, of Jews, Greeks, Circassians, Scotchmen, ancient Romans, and other heterogeneous elements.

In his paper on the Mongolian Affinities of the Caucasians, published in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (1853) Mr. Hodgson has both confirmed and developed the doctrine here indicated — his *data* on the side of Caucasus being those of the Asia Polyglotta, but those on the side of Tibet and China being vastly augmented; and that, to a great extent, through his own efforts and researches.

Upon the evidence of Mr. Hodgson I lay more than or-

dinary value; not merely on the strength of his acumen and acquirements in general, but from the fact of his *ex-professo* studies as a naturalist leading him to over-value rather than under-value those differences of physical conformation that (to take extreme forms) contrast the Georgian and Circassian noble with the Chinese, or Tibetan labourer. Nevertheless, his evidence is decided.

ON THE TUSHI LANGUAGE.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

FEBRUARY THE 15TH. 1858.

So little light has been thrown upon the languages of Caucasus, that a publication of the year 1856, entitled *Versuch über die Thusch-Sprache*, by A. Schieffner, may be allowed to stand as a text for a short commentary.

The Tushi is a language belonging to the least known of the five classes into which Klaproth, in his *Asia Polyglotta*, distributes the languages of Caucasus: viz. (1.) the Georgian. (2.) the Osset or Iron. (3) the Lesgian. (4.) the Mizhdzhedzhi. And (5.) the Tsherkess or Circassian. It is to the fourth of these that the Tushi belongs; the particular district in which it is spoken being that of Tzowa, where it is in contact with the Georgian of Georgia; from which, as well as from the Russian, it has adopted several words.

The *data* consist in communications from a native of the district, Georg Ziskorow, with whom the author came in contact at St. Petersburg. They have supplied a grammatical sketch, a short lexicon, and some specimens in the way of composition, consisting of translations of portions of the Gospels, and two short tales of an Arabic or Persian rather than a truly native character. They are accompanied by a German translation.

Taking the groups as we find them in Klaproth, we may ask what amount of illustration each has received in respect to its *grammar*. In respect to the vocabularies, the *Asia Polyglotta* gives us specimens of them all.

The Georgian has long been known through the grammar of Maggi, published upwards of two centuries ago. The researches of Rosen on its several dialects are quite recent. Of the Iron there is a copious dictionary by Sjögren, and

a short sketch of its grammar by Rosen. The alphabet is Russian, with additions. Rosen has also given a grammatical sketch of the Circassian. This, however, as well as his notice of the Osset, is exceedingly brief. Of the Lesgian we have no grammar at all; and of the Mizhdzhedzhi, or Tshetshent group, the first grammatical sketch is the one before us.

The alphabet is the ordinary Roman modified; the work being addressed to the Russians rather than the natives, and to the European *savans* in general rather than to the Russians. Otherwise the Georgian alphabet might have been used with advantage; for it is especially stated that the Georgian and Tushi sound-systems are alike. The modifications to which our own alphabet has been subjected, are those that Castrèn has made in his Samoyed grammar and lexicon. So that we may say that it is in Castrèn's Samoyed mode of writing that Schieffner's Tushi grammar and lexicon are exhibited.

In respect to the general relations of the language, the evidence of the work under notice is confirmatory (though not absolutely) of the views to which the present writer has committed himself, viz. — (1.) that the languages of Caucasus in general are so nearly *mono*-syllabic as to be with fitness designated *pauro*-syllabic; (2.) that the distinction drawn by Klaproth between the Mizhdzhedzhi and Lesgian groups is untenable; both belonging to the same class, a fact by which the philologic ethnography of Caucasus is, *pro tanto*, simplified. Upon the first of these points Schieffner writes, that the avoidance of polysyllabic forms has introduced all manner of abbreviations in the language; upon the second, that the little he has seen of the Lesgian grammar induces him to connect it with the Tshetshents. It should be added, however, that in respect to its monosyllabic character, he maintains that the shortness of many of its words is due to a secondary process; so that the older form of the language was more polysyllabic than the present.

Of the chief details, the formation of the cases of the nouns comes first. The declension of the personal pronouns is as follows. With a slight modification it is that of the ordinary substantive as well.

SINGULAR.	I.	THOU.	HE.
Nominative . .	so	ḫo	o.
Genitive	sai	ḫai	oχu.
——	——	——	ouχ.
——	——	——	oχuin.

SINGULAR.	I.	THOU.	HE.
Dative	son	ḫon	oxun.
——.	sona	——.	ouxna.
Instructive . .	as	aḫ.	oxus.
——.	asa	aḫa	oxuse.
——.	——.	——.	ouxse.
Affective	sox	ḫox	oxux.
Allative	sogo	ḫogo	oxugo.
——.	——.	——.	ouxgo.
Elative	soxi.	ḫoxi	ouxxi.
——.	——.	——.	oxxi (?).
Comitative . . .	soci.	ḫoci	oxuci.
——.	——.	——.	ouxci.
——.	——.	——.	oxci (?).
Terminative . .	sogomci	ḫogomci	ouxgomci.
Adessive	sogoh	ḫogoḫ	ouxgoḫ.
Ablative	sogredah	ḫogredah . . .	ouxgore.
——.	——.	——.	ouxgoredah.

PLURAL.	WE.		YE.	THEY.
Nominative . .	wai	‘txo . . .	su.	obi.
Genitive	wai	‘txai. . .	śui	oxri.
Dative	wain	‘txon . .	śun	oxarn.
——.	——	——. . .	suna	——
Instructive . .	wai	a‘txo . .	aiś	oxar.
——.	——	——. . .	aśi	oxra.
Affective	waix	‘txox . .	śux	oxarx.
Allative	waigo	‘txogo .	śugo	oxargo.
Illative	wailo	‘txolo . .	śulo	oxarlo.
Elative	waixi	‘tzoxi . .	śuxi	oxarxi.
Comitative . . .	waici	‘txoci . .	śuci.	oxarci.
Adessive	waigoh	‘txogoh.	śugoḫ	oxargoḫ.
Inessive (c.) . .	wailoh	‘txoloḫ.	śuloḫ.	oxarloḫ.
Ablative (c.) .	waigre	‘txogre.	śugre	oxargore.
——.	——	——. . .	——.	oxardah.
Elative (c.) . .	wailre	‘txolre .	śulre.	oḫarlore.
Conversive . . .	waigoih	‘txogoih	śugoiḫ.	oḫargoih.

That some of these forms are no true inflexions, but appended prepositions, is speedily stated in the text. If so, it is probable that, in another author or in a different dialect, the number of cases will vary. At any rate, the agglutinate character of the language is indicated. The numerals are —

CARDINAL.	ORDINAL.	CARDINAL.	ORDINAL.
1. cha	duihre.	8. barl	barloġe.
2. ši	silġe.	9. iss	issloġe.
3. x̣o.	x̣alġe.	10. itt	ittloġe.
4. ahew	dhewloġe.	11. cha-itt . .	cha-ittloġe.
5. ṗxi	pxilġe.	12. si-itt	si-ittloġe.
6. jeix	jeixloġe.	19. tqeexç. . .	iqeex̣loġe.
7. worl	worloġe.	20. tqa	tqalġe.

This as a word the author connects with the word *tqo* = *also, overagain* (*auch*, *wiederum*), as if it were 10 doubled, which it most likely is. In like manner *tqeexc* is *one from twenty* = *undeviginti*: —

100 = ṗxauztqa = 5 × 20.
200 = içatatq = 10 × 20.
300 = ṗxiiæatq = 12 × 20.
400 = tqauziq = 20 × 20.
500 = tqauziġ ṗxauztqa = 20 × 20 + 100.
1000 = sac tqauziqa icaiqa = 2 × 400 + 200.

The commonest signs of the plural number are *-i* and *-si*, the latter = *is* in Tshetshents. The suffixes *-ne* and *-bi*, the latter of which is found in Lesgian, is stated to be Georgian in origin. No reason, however, against its being native is given.

In verbs, the simplest form is (as usual) the imperative. Add to this *-a*, and you have the infinitive. The sign of the conditional is *ḥe* or *ḥ*; that of the conjunctive *ḷe* or *ḷ*.

The tenses are —

(1.) Present, formed by adding *-a* or *-u* to the root: *i. e.* to the imperative form, and changing the vowel.

(2.) Imperfect, by adding *-r* to the present.

(3.) Aorist, formed by the addition of *-r* to the

(4.) Perfect; the formation of which is not expressly given, but which is said to differ from the present in not changing the vowel. However, we have the forms *xet* = *find*, *xeli* = *found*; (perf.) *xetin* = *found* (aorist). From the participle of the perfect is formed the

(5.) Pluperfect by adding *-r*.

(6.) The future is either the same as the present, or a modification of it.

I give the names of those moods and tenses as I find them. The language of the Latin grammar has, probably, been too closely imitated.

The first and second persons are formed by appending

the pronouns either in the nominative or the instructive form. That an oblique form of the pronoun should appear in the personal inflexion of verbs is no more than what the researches of the late Mr. Garnett, with which we are all so familiar, have taught us to expect. At the same time, the extent to which the instructive and nominative forms are alike must be borne in mind. Let either be appended; and, when so appended, undergo (under certain conditions) certain modifications, and a double origin is simulated. That this is the case in the instances of the work under notice is by no means asserted. The possibility of its being so is suggested.

The participle of the present tense is formed in *-in*; as *dago* = *eat*, *dagu-in* = *eating*.

The participle of the preterite ends in *-no*; as *xaçe* = *hear*, *xaç-no* = *heard*.

There are auxiliary verbs, and no small amount of euphonic changes; of which one, more especially, deserves notice. It is connected with the gender of nouns. When certain words (adjectives or the so-called verb substantive) follow certain substantives, they change their initial. Thus ḥatxleen *wa* = *the prophet is*, ḥatxleensi *ba* = *the prophets are*, waśo *wa* = *the brother is*, waśar *ba* = *the brothers are*.

Again — naw *ja* = *the ship is*, nawr *ja* = *the ships are;* bstiuno *ja* = *the wife is*, bstee *da* = *the wives are*.

This is said to indicate gender, but how do we know what gender is? The words themselves have neither form nor inflexion which indicates it. Say that instead of gender it means sex, *i. e.* that the changes in question are regulated by natural rather than grammatical characters. We still find that the word *naw* is considered feminine — feminine and inanimate. This, however, is grammatical rather than natural, sex — "das weibliche Geschlecht wird bey *unbelebten* Gegenständeu auch im Plural durch *j-*, bei *belebten* durch *a* ausgedrückt." Then follow the examples just given. How, however, do we know that these words are feminine? It is submitted that the explanation of this very interesting initial change has yet to be given. It recalls, however, to our memory the practice of more languages than one, the Keltic, the Woloff, the Kafre, and several other African tongues, wherein the change is initial, though not always on the same principle.

So, also, the division of objects into animate and inanimate recalls to our mind some African, and numerous American, tongues.

Such is the notice of the first of the Mizhdzhedzhi or

Tshetshents (we may say Lesgian) forms of speech of which the grammatical structure has been investigated; a notice which suggests the question concerning its affinities and classification.

The declension points to the Ugrian, or Fin, class of languages; with which not only the Tshetshents, but all the other languages of Caucasus have long been known to have miscellaneous affinities. The resemblance, however, may be more apparent than real. The so-called cases may be combinations of substantives and prepositions rather than true inflexions, and the terminology may be more Ugrian in form than in reality. Even if the powers of the cases be the same, it will not prove much. Two languages expressing a given number of the relations that two nouns may bear to each other will, generally, express the same. Cases are genitive, dative and the like all the world over — and that independent of any philological affinity between the languages in which they occur. The extent to which they are also Caritive, Adessive and the like has yet to be investigated.

The Ugrian affinities, then, of the Tshetshents are indirect; it being the languages of its immediate neighbourhood with which it is more immediately connected. In the way of vocabularies the lists of the *Asiâ Polyglotta* have long been competent to show this. In the way of grammar the evidence is, still, far from complete. The Georgian, to which Maggi gives no more than six cases, has a far scantier declension than the Tushi, at least as it appears here. The Circassian, according to Rosen, is still poorer.

In the verbs the general likeness is greater.

In the pronouns, however, the most definite similarity is to be found; as may be seen from the following forms in the Circassian: —

Ab = *father*.

1. S-ab = *my father*.	2. H-ab = *our father*.
W-ab = *thy father*.	S′-ab = *your father*.
L-ab = *his father*.	S-ab = *their father*.

To which add —

Sa-ra = *I*.	*Ha*-ra = *we*.
Wa-ra = *thou*.	*S′a*-ra = *ye*.
Ui = *he*.	*U*-bart = *they*.

The amount of likeness here is considerable. Over and above the use of *s* for the first person singular, the *s′* in the

second person plural should be noticed. So should the *b* and *r* in the Circassian u-*bart*; both of which are plural elements in the Tushi also.

Finally (as a point of general philology), the double forms of the Tushi plurals *wai* and *txo* suggest the likelihood of their being exclusive and inclusive; one denoting the speaker but not the person spoken to, the other both the person spoken to and the person who speaks; plurals of this kind being well known to be common in many of the ruder languages.

ON THE NAME AND NATION OF THE DACIAN KING DECEBALUS, WITH NOTICES OF THE AGATHYRSI AND ALANI.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

APRIL 17TH 1854.

The text of Herodotus places the Agathyrsi in Transylvania (there or thereabouts). (See F. W. Newman On Scythia and the surrounding Countries, according to Herodotus, Philological Society's Proceedings, vol. i. p. 77.)

The subsequent authors speak of them as a people who painted (tattooed?) their bodies; the usual epithet being *picti*.

The same epithet is applied to the *Geloni*; also a population of the Scythia of Herodotus.

For accurate knowledge the locality of the Agathyrsans was too remote — too remote until, at least, the date of the Dacian wars; but the Dacian wars are, themselves, eminently imperfect in their details, and unsatisfactory in respect to the authorities for them.

There is every reason, then, for a nation in the locality of the Agathyrsi remaining obscure — in the same predicament (say) with the Hyperborei, or with the occupants of Thule.

But there is no reason for supposing the obliteration of the people so called; nor yet for supposing a loss of its name, whether native or otherwise.

Hence, when we get the details of Dacia we may reasonably look out for Agathyrsi.

How far must we expect to find their name unmodified? This depends upon the population through whom the classical writers, whether Latin or Greek, derived it. Now it is submitted, that if we find a notice of them in the fifth century A. D., and that in an account relating to Dacia and

Pannonia, the *medium* has, probably, been different from that through which Herodotus, amongst the Greek colonies of the Black Sea, obtained *his* accounts. The details of this difference of *medium* are not very important, and the discussion of them would be episodical to the present paper, if not irrelevant. It is enough to remark, that a difference of *medium* is probable; and, as a consequence thereof, a difference in the form of the name.

This is preliminary and introductory to the notice of the following passage of Priscus, to whom we owe the account of one of the embassies to Attila — Ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἦρχε τῶν Ἀκατζίρων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐθνῶν νεμομένων τὴν πρὸς τὸν Πόντον Σκυθικήν. Another form (also in Priscus) is Ἀκαΐτιροι. They are specially called *Akatiri Hunni*. Jornandes' form is *Acatziri*.

Place for place, this gives us the Agathyrsi of Herodotus as near as can be expected; and, name for name it does the same: the inference being that the *Akatziri* of Priscus are the descendants of the *Agathyrsi* of Herodotus. Of course, evidence of any kind to the migration, extinction, or change of name on the part of the population in question would invalidate this view. Such evidence, however, has not been produced, nor has the present writer succeeded in finding, though he has sought for it.

Descendants then of the *Agathyrsi*, and ancestors of the *Akatziri* may have formed part of the population of Dacia when Domitian and Trajan fought against Decebalus; a part that may have been large or small, weak or powerful, homogeneous with the rest of Dacia or different from it. Assuming it to have been different, it may still have supplied soldiers — even leaders. Decebalus himself may as easily have belonged to the Agathyrsan part of Dacia as to any other. A very little evidence will turn the balance in so obscure a point as the present.

Now, no German and no Slavonic dialects give us either the meaning of the name Decebalus or any name like it. It stands alone in *European* history. Where does it appear? In the history of the *Turks*. The first known king of the Turks bears the same name as the last of the Dacians. *Dizabulus* (Διζαβούλος) was that khan of the Turks of Tartary to whom Justinian sent an embassy when the Avars invaded the Eastern empire.

This (as is freely admitted) is a small fact, if taken alone; but this should not be done. The *cumulative* character of the evidence in all matters of this kind should be borne in mind, and the value of small facts measured by the extent

to which they stand alone, or are strengthened by the coincidence of others. In the latter case they assume importance in proportion to the mutual support they give each other; the value of any two being always more than double that of either taken singly.

On the other hand, each must rest on some separate substantive evidence of its own. To say that *Decebalus was an Agathyrsan because the Agathyrsans were Turks*, and that the *Agathyrsans were Turks because Decebalus was one of them*, is illegitimate. There must be some special evidence in each case, little or much.

Now the evidence that the *Agathyrsi* were Turks lies in the extent to which (*a*) they were Scythians (*Skoloti*), and (*b*) the Scythians (*Skoloti*) were Turks; — neither of which facts is either universally admitted or universally denied. The present writer, however, holds the Turk character of the Agathyrsi on grounds wholly independent of anything in the present paper; indeed, the suggestion that the *Acatziri* are *Agathyrsi* is, not his, but Zeuss'. — (See *Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme*, *v. Bulgari*, p. 714.)

If *Agathyrs-* be *Akatzir-* in some older, what is the latter word in any newer form? — for such there probably is. Word for word, it is probably the same as *Khazar*, a denomination for an undoubtedly Turk tribe which occurs for the first time in Theophanes: — *Τοῦρκοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἑῴας οὓς Χαζάρους ὀνομάζουσιν.* This is A. D. 626. Whether, however, the same populations were denoted is uncertain. There are certain difficulties in the supposition that they were absolutely identical.

It is not, however, necessary that they should be so. There might be more than one division of a great stock, like the Turk so called. Nay, they might have been populations other than Turk so designated, provided only that there were some Turk population in their neighbourhood so to call them. More than this. The word may be current at the present moment, though, of course, in a modified form. Suppose it to have been the Turk translation of *pictus*; or rather, suppose the word *pictus* to be the Latin translation of *Agathyrs-*(*Akatzir-*): what would the probable consequence be? Even this, that wherever there was a *painted* (or *tattooed*) population in the neighbourhood of any member of the great Turk stock, the name, or something like it, might arise. Be it so. If the members of the same Turk stock lay wide apart, the corresponding painted or tattooed populations lying wide apart also might take the same name.

The details suggested by this line of criticism may form

the subject of another paper. In the present, the author hazards a fresh observation — an observation on a population often associated with the Agathyrsi, viz. the *Geloni*. Seeing that we have such forms as *Unni* (the Greek form is *Οὖννοι*, not *Οὔννοι*) and *Chuni* (= *Huns*); *Arpi* and *Carpi*; *Attuarii* and *Chattuari*, &c.; and seeing the affinity between the sounds of *g* and *k;* he believes that the word *Geloni* may take another form and begin with a vowel (*Elôni*, *Alôni*). Seeing that their locality is nearly that of the *Alani* of a latter period; seeing that the middle syllable in Alani (in one writer at least) is long — *ἀλκήεντες Ἀλαῦνοι*; seeing that Herodotus, who mentions the *Geloni*, knows no Alani, whereas the authors who describe the Alani make (with one exception about to be noticed) no mention of the Geloni, he identifies the two populations, Geloni and Alani, or *vice versâ*. He deduces something more from this root *l* — *n* (*λ* — *ν*). Let the name for the Alans have reached the Greeks of the Euxine through two different dialects of some interjacent language; let the form it took in Greek have been parisyllabic in one case, whereas it was imparisyllabic in the other, and we have two plurals, one in *-οι*, as *Γέλωνοι*, *Ἄλαννοι*, *Ἄλανοι*, and another in *-ες*, as *Γέλωνες*, *Ἄλαννες*, *Ἄλανες*, — possible, and even probable, modifications of the original name, whatever that was. Now, name for name, *Αλανες* comes very near *Ελληνες*; and in this similarity may lie the explanation of the statement of Herodotus as to the existence of certain *Scythian Greeks* (*Ἕλληνες Σκύθαι*) — iv. 17. 108. If so these *Scythian Greeks* were *Alans*.

The exception, indicated a few lines above, to the fact of only one author mentioning both *Geloni* and *Alani*, is to be found in Ammianus Marcellinus (xxxi. 2. 13. 14). The passage is too long to quote. It is clear, however, that whilst his *Alani* are spoken of from his own knowledge, his *Geloni* are brought in from his book-learning, *i. e.* from Herodotus.

NOTES.

Note 1.

Evidence of any kind to the migration, extinction or change of name on the part of the populations in question would invalidate this view. Such evidence has not been produced &c. — The fuller consideration of the question involved in this statement is to be found in Dr. W. Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography vv. Hunni, Scythia, and Sarmatia.*

Note 2.

The details suggested by this line of criticism &c. — There are to the effect that in the word *Agathyrsi* we get an early Turk gloss, of which the history is somewhat curious. It exists, at the present moment in England, having come *via* Hungary. It exists in Siberia, on the very frontier of the America.

It is the English word *Hussar* = *Khazar*. Here we have it in its abbreviated form.

It is the Siberian word Yukahir, Yukazhir, or Yukadzhir.

The "*native* name of the Yukahiri of Siberia is *Andon Domni*. The Koriaks call them *Atal*. Their other neighbours are the Turk Yakuts. Hence it is probable that it is to the Yakut language that the term Yukahir (also *Yukadzhir*) is referrible. If so, its probable meaning is the same as the Koriak *Atal*, which means *spotted*. It applies to the Yukahiri from their spotted deerskin dresses.

Now, south of these same Yakuts, who are supposed to call the Andon Domni by the name Yukahiri (or Yukadzhiri), live a tribe of Tungusians. These are called *Tshapodzhir* — but *not* by themselves. By whom? By no one so probably as by the Yakuts. Why? Because they tattoo themselves. If so, it is probable that *Yukadzhir* and *Tshapodzhir* are one and the same word; at any rate, a likely meaning in a likely language has been claimed for it.

Let it, then, be considered as a Turk word, meaning *spotted, tattooed, painted*, — provisionally. It may appear in any part of the Turk area, provided only, that some nation to which one of the three preceding adjectives applies be found in its neighbourhood. It may appear, too, in any state of any Turk form of speech. But there are Turk forms of speech as far distant from the Lena and Tunguska as Syria or Constantinople; and there are Turk glosses as old as Herodotus. One of these the present writer believes to be the word *Agathyrsi*, being provided with special evidence to shew that the nation so called were either themselves Turks or on a Turk frontier. Now, the Agathyrsi are called the *picti* Agathyrsi; and it is submitted to the reader that the one term is the translation of the other — the words *Agathyrs* (also *Akatzir*), *Yukadzhir*, and *Tshapodzhir*, being one and the same." — From the author's *Native Races of the Russian Empire*.

ON THE LANGUAGE OF LANCASHIRE, UNDER THE ROMANS.

READ

BEFORE THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE.

8TH JANUARY, 1857.

In the present paper, advantage is taken of the local character of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, to make the name of the county serve as a special text for a general subject. What applies to Lancashire applies to any county in Roman England.

The doctrine is as follows—that in Lancashire particularly, and in England in general, the predominant language for the first five centuries of our era was not Latin but British.

The writer is so far from laying this down as a novelty, that he is by no means certain, that it may not be almost a truism. He is by no means certain, that there is a single one of those to whom he addresses himself, who may now hold, or even have held, the opposite opinion. He is fully aware that excellent authorities have maintained both sides of the question. He is only doubtful as to the extent to which the one doctrine may preponderate over the other.

If the question were to be settled by an appeal to the history of the more influential opinions concerning it, we should find that, in a reference to the earliest and the latest of our recent investigators, Dr. Prichard would maintain one side of the question, Mr. Wright another. The paper of the latter, having been printed in the Transactions of the Society, is only alluded to. The opinion of Dr. Prichard is conveyed in the following extract — "The use of languages really cognate must be allowed to furnish a proof, or at least a strong presumption, of kindred race. Exceptions may in-

deed, under very peculiar circumstances, occur to the inference founded on this ground. For example, the French language is likely to be the permanent idiom of the negro people of St. Domingo, though the latter are principally of African descent. Slaves imported from various districts in Africa, having no common idiom, have adopted that of their masters. But conquest, or even captivity, under different circumstances, has scarcely ever exterminated the native idiom of any people, unless after many ages of subjection; and even then, vestiges have perhaps always remained of its existence. In Britain, the native idiom was nowhere superseded by the Roman, though the island was held in subjection upwards of three centuries. In Spain and in Gaul, several centuries of Latin domination, and fifteen under German and other modern dynasties, have proved insufficient entirely to obliterate the ancient dialects, which were spoken by the native people before the Roman conquest. Even the Gypsies, who have wandered in small companies over Europe for some ages, still preserve their original languape in a form that can be everywhere recognised."*

Upon the whole, I think that the current opinion is in favour of the language of Roman Britain having been Latin; at any rate I am sure that, before I went very closely into the subject, my own views were, at least, in that direction. "What the present language of England would have been, had the Norman conquest never taken place, the analogy of Holland, Denmark, and many other countries enables us to dermine. It would have been as it is at present. What it would have been had the *Saxon* conquest never taken place, is a question wherein there is far more speculation. Of France, of Italy, of Wallachia, and of the Spanish Peninsula, the analogies all point the same way. They indicate that the original Celtic would have been superseded by the Latin of the Conquerors, and consequently that our language, in its later stages, would have been neither British nor Gaelic, but Roman. Upon these analogies, however, we may refine. Italy was from the beginning, Roman; the Spanish Peninsula was invaded full early; no ocean divided Gaul from Rome; and the war against the ancestors of the Wallachians was a war of extermination."†

In these preliminary remarks we find a sufficient reason for going specially into the question; not, however, as discoverers of any new truth, nor as those who would correct

* Eastern Origin of the Celtic Languages, p. 8. † English Language, First Edition, p. 68.

some general error, but rather, in a judicial frame of mind, and with the intention of asking, first, how far the actual evidence is (either way) conclusive; next, which way (supposing it to be inconclusive) the presumption lies; and thirdly, what follows in the way of inference from each of the opposing views.

What are the statements of the classical writers, *subsequent to the reduction of Britain*, to the effect that the Romans, when they conquered a Province, established their language? I know of none. I know of none, indeed, *anterior* to the Britannic conquest. I insert, however, the limitation, because in case such exist, it is necessary to remember that they would not be conclusive. The practice may have changed in the interval.

Is there anything approaching such a statement? There is a passage in Seneca to the effect "that where the Roman conquers there he settles."

But he conquered Britain. Therefore he established his language. Add to this that where he established his own language, there the native tongue became obliterated. Therefore the British died off.

If so, the Angles — when they effected *their* conquest — must have displaced, by their own English, a Latin rather than a British, form of speech.

But is this the legitimate inference from the passage in question? No. On the contrary, it is a conclusion by no means warranted by the premises. Nevertheless, as far as external testimony is concerned, there are no better premises to be found.

But there is another element in our reasoning. In four large districts at least, — in the Spanish Peninsula, in France, in the Grisons, and in the Danubian Principalities — the present language is a derivative from the Latin, which was, undoubtedly and undeniably, introduced by the Roman conquest. From such clear and known instances, the reasoning to the obscure and unknown is a legitimate analogy, and the inference is that Britain was what Gallia, Rhætia, Hispania, and Dacia were.

In this we have a second reason for the fact that there are many who, with Arnold, hold, that except in the particular case of Greece, the Roman world, in general, at the date of the break-up of the Empire, was Latin in respect to its language. At any rate, Britannia is reasonably supposed to be in the same category with Dacia — a country conquered later.

On the other hand, however, there are the following considerations.

I. In the first place the Angle conquest was gradual; so gradual as to give us an insight into the character of the population that was conquered. Was this (in language) Latin? There is no evidence of its having been so. But is there evidence of its having been British? A little. How much, will be considered in the sequel.

II. In the next place the Angle conquest was (and is) incomplete; inasmuch as certain remains of the earlier and non-Angle population still exist. Are these Latin? Decidedly not; but on the contrary British, — witness the present Britons of Wales, and the all but British Cornish-men, who are now British in blood, and until the last century were, more or less, British in language as well.

But this is not all. There was a third district which was slow to become Angle, viz.: part of the mountain district of Cumberland and Westmorland. What was this before it was Angle? Not Roman but British.

Again — there was a time when Monmouthshire, with (no doubt) some portion of the adjoining counties, was in the same category in respect to its *non*-Angle character with Wales. What was it in respect to language? Not Roman but British.

Again — *mutatis mutandis*. Devonshire was to Cornwall as Monmouth to Wales. Was it Roman? No — but, on the contrary, British.

Now say, for the sake of argument, that Cornwall, Wales, and Cumberland were never Roman at all. and consequently, that they prove nothing in the question as to the introduction of the Latin language. But can we say, for even the sake of argument, that Devon and Monmouth were never Roman? Was not, on the contrary, Devon at least, exceedingly Roman, as is shewn by the importance of Isca Danmoniorum, or Exeter.

Or, say that the present population of Wales is no representative of the ancient occupants of that part of Britain, but, on the contrary, descended from certain immigrants from the more eastern and less mountainous parts of England. I do not hold this doctrine. Admitting it, however, for the sake of argument — whence came the present Welsh, if it came not from a part of England where British, rather than Latin, was spoken? There must have been British somewhere; and probably British to the exclusion of Latin.

The story of St. Guthlac of Croyland is well-known. It runs to the effect that being disturbed, one night, by a hor-

rid howling, he was seriously alarmed, thinking that the howlers might be *Britons*. Upon looking-out, however, he discovered that they were only devils — whereby he was comforted, the Briton being the worse of the two. Now the later we make this apocryphal story, the more it tells in favor of there having been Britons in Lincolnshire, long after the Angle conquest. Yet Lincolnshire (except so far as it was Dane,) must have been one of the most Angle portions of England. In France, Spain, Portugal, the Grisons, Wallachia or Moldavia, such devils as those of St. Guthlac would have been Romans.

As the argument, then, stands at present, we have traces of the British as opposed to the Angle, but no traces of the Latin in similar opposition.

Let us now look at the *analogies*, viz: Spain, (including Portugal,) France, Switzerland and the Danubian Principalities; in all of which we have had an aboriginal population and a Roman conquest, in all of which, too, we have had a third conquest subsequent to that by Rome — even as in Britain we have had the triple series of (A) native Britains, (B) Roman conquerors, (C) Angles.

What do we find? In all but Switzerland, remains of the original tongue; in all, without exception, remains of the language of the population that conquered the Romans; in all, without exception, something Roman.

In Britain we find nothing Roman; but, on the contrary, only the original tongue and the language of the third population.

I submit that this is strong *primâ facie* evidence in favour of the Latin having never been the general language of Britain. If it were so, the area of the Angle conquest must have exactly coincided with the area of the Latin language. Is this probable? I admit that it is anything but highly improbable. The same practicable character of the English parts of Britain (as opposed to the Welsh, Cornish, and Cumbrian) which made the conquest of a certain portion of the Island easy to the Romans as against the Britons, may have made it easy for the Angles as against the Romans; and *vice versa*, the impracticable character of Wales, Cornwall, and Cumberland, that protected the Britons against their first invaders, may have done the same for them against the second. If so, the two areas of foreign conquest would coincide. I by no means undervalue this argument.

It is almost unnecessary to say that the exact conditions under which Britain was reduced were not those of any other Roman Province.

In respect to Spain, the Roman occupancy was *early*, having begun long before that of Northern and Central Gaul, having begun during the Punic wars, and having become sufficiently settled by the time of Augustus to command the attention of Strabo on the strength of the civilization it had developed. In Spain, then, there was priority in point of time to account for any extraordinary amount of Roman influences.

Gaul, with the exception of the earlier acquisitions in the Narbonensis, was the conquest of one of the most thorough-going of conquerors. The number of enemies that Cæsar, slaughtered has been put at 1,000,000. Without knowing the grounds of this calculation, we may safely say that his campaigns were eminently of a destructive character.

The conquerors of the Breuni, Genauni, and similar occupants of those parts of Switzerland where the Rumonsch Language (of Latin origin) is now spoken, were men of similar energy. Neither Drusus nor Tiberius spared an enemy who opposed. Both were men who would "make a solitude and call it peace."

That Trajan's conquest of Dacia was of a similar radical and thorough-going character is nearly certain.

Now, the evidence that the conquests of the remaining provinces were like those of the provinces just noted, is by no means strong. At the same time, it must be admitted that the analogy established by four such countries as Gaul, Spain, Switzerland, and Moldo-Wallachia is cogent. What was the extent to which Africa, Pannonia, Illyricum, Thrace, and the Mœsias were Romanized? Of Asia? I say nothing. It was sufficiently Greek to have been in the same category with Greece itself, and in Greece itself we know that no attempts were made upon the language.

Africa was Latin in its literature; and, at a later period, pre-eminently Latin in its Christianity. But the evidence that the vernacular language was Latin is *nil*, and the presumptions unfavourable. The Berber tongue of the present native tribes of the whole district between Egypt and the Atlantic is certainly of high antiquity; it being a well-known fact, that in it, several of the names in the geography of classical Africa are significant. Now this is spread over the country indifferently. Neither does it show any notable signs of Latin intermixture. Neither is there trace, or shadow of trace, of any form of speech of Latin origin throughout the whole of Tunis, Tripoli, Algiers or Morocco.

In Pannonia and Illyricum, the same absence of any language of Latin origin is manifest. Pannonia and Illyricum

have had more than an average amount of subsequent conquerors and occupants — Goths, Huns, Avars, Bulgarians, Slavonians, Hungarians, Germans. That the Slovak, however, in the north, and the Dalmatian forms of the Servian in the south, represent the native languages is generally admitted — now, if not long ago. These, then, have survived. Why not, then, the Latin if it ever took root?

In respect to Thrace, it is just possible that it may have been, in its towns at least, sufficiently Greek to have been in the same category with Greece proper. I say that this is just possible. In reality, however, it was more likely to be constrasted with Greece than to be classed with it. One thing, however, is certain, viz.: — that the country district round Constantinople was never a district in which Latin was vernacular. Had it been so, the fact could hardly have been unnoticed, or without influence on the unequivocally Greek Metropolis of the Eastern Empire.

If the doctrine that Thrace may have been sufficiently Greek to forbid the indroduction of the Latin be doubtful, the notion that the Mœsias were so is untenable. Yet the Latin never seems to have been vernacular in either of them. Had it been so, it would probably have held its ground, especially in the impracticable mountains and forests of Upper Mœsia or the modern Servia. Yet where is there a trace of it? Of all the Roman Provinces, Servia or Upper Mœsia seems to be the one wherein the evidence of a displacement of the native, and a development of a Latin form of speech, is at its *minimum*, and the instance of Servia is the one upon which the analogous case of Britain best rests.

The insufficiency of the current reasons in favour of the modern Servian being of recent introduction have been considered by me elsewhere.

Now comes the notice of a text which always commands the attention of the ethnological philologue, when he is engaged upon the Angle period of our island's history. It refers to the middle of the eighth century, the era of the Venerable Beda, from whose writings it is taken. I give it *in extenso*. It runs "Hæc in presenti, juxta numerum librorum quibus lex divina scripta est, quinque gentium linguis, unam eandemque summæ veritatis et veræ sublimitatis scientiam scrutatur et confitetur; Anglorum, videlicet, Brittonum, Scottorum, Pictorum et Latinorum quæ meditatione scripturarum, cæteris omnibus est facta communis.*

That the Latin here is the Latin of Ecclesiastical, rather

* *Hist. Eccl. l.* 1. *c.* 1.

than Imperial, Rome, the Latin of the Scriptures rather than classical writers, the Latin of a written book rather than a Lingua Rustica, is implied by the context.

Should this, however, be doubted, the following passage, which makes the languages of Britain only *four*, is conclusive — "Omnes nationes et provincias Brittanniæ, quæ in *quatuor* linguas, id est Brittonum, Pictorum, Scottorum et Anglorum divisæ sunt, in ditione accepit."*

It is the first of these two statements of Beda's that the following extract from Wintoun is founded on.

Cronykil, I. xiii, 39.

Of Langagis in Bretayne sere
I fynd that sum tym fyf thare were:
Of Brettys fyrst, and Inglis syne,
Peycht, and Scot, and syne Latyne.
Bot, of the Peychtis, is ferly,
That ar wndon sá hályly,
That nowthir remanande ar Language,
Næ succession of Lynage:
Swá of thare antiqwytè
Is lyk bot fabyl for to be.

But the Latin of the scriptures may have been the Latin of common life as well. Scarcely. The change from the written to the spoken language was too great for this. What the latter would have been we can infer. It would have been something like the following "Pro Deo amur et pro Xristian poblo et nostro commun salvament d'ist di en avant, in quant Deus savir et poder me dunat, si salvarai eo cist meon fradre Karlo, et in ajudha et in cadhuna cosa, si com om per dreit son fradre salvar dist, in o quid il me altresi fazet: et ab Ludher nul plaid nunquam prindrai uni, meon vol, cist meon fradre Karle in damno sit."

This is the oath of the Emperors Karl and Ludwig, sons of Charlemagne, as it was sworn by the former in A. D. 842. It is later in date than the time of Beda by about a century; being in the Lingua Rustica of France. Nevertheless, it is a fair specimen of the difference between the spoken languages of the countries that had once been Roman Provinces and the written Latin. Indeed, it was not Latin, but Romance; and, in like manner, any vernacular form of speech, used in Britain but of Roman origin, would have been Romance also.

* *Eccl. Hist.* iii, 6.

The conclusion which the present notice suggests is —

That the testimony of authors tells neither way.

That the presumptions in favour of the Latin which are raised by the cases of Gaul, Spain, Rhætia, and Dacia, are anything but conclusive.

That the inferences from the earliest as well as the latest data as to the condition of *English* Britain, the inferences from the Angle conquest, and the inferences from the present language of Wales, are decidedly against the Latin.

I may, perhaps. be allowed to conclude by a reference to a paper already alluded to, as having been laid before the present Society, by Mr. Wright. This is to the effect, that the Latin reigned paramount not only in England, but in Wales also, under the Roman dominion; the present Welsh being of recent introduction from Armorica.

That the population was heterogeneous is certain, the Roman Legionaries being, to a great extent, other than Roman. It is also certain that there was, within the island, at an early period, no inconsiderable amount of Teutonic blood. It is certain, too, that the name *Briton* had different applications at different times.

If so, the difference between Mr. Wright and myself, in respect to the homogeneousness or heterogeneousness of the Britannic population, is only a matter of degree.

In respect to the particular fact, as to whether the British or Latin language was the vernacular form of speech, we differ more decidedly. That the British was unwritten and uncultivated is true; so that the exclusive use of the Latin for inscriptions is only what we expect. The negative fact that no British name has been found inscribed, I by no means undervalue.

The *preponderance*, however, of a Non-British population, and the use of the Latin as the *vernacular* language, are doctrines, which the few undoubted facts of our early history impugn rather than verify.

The main difficulty which Mr. Wright's hypothesis meets — and it *does* meet it — lies in the fact of the similarity between the Welsh and Armorican being too great for anything but a comparatively recent separation to account for. Nevertheless, even this portion of what may be called the Armorican hypothesis, is by no means incompatible with the doctrine of the present paper. The Celtic of Armorica may as easily have displaced the *older* Celtic of Britain (from which, by hypothesis, it notably differed) as it is supposed to have displaced the Latin.

I do not imagine this to have been the case; indeed I can

see reasons against it, arising out of the application of Mr. Wright's own line of criticism.

I think it by no means unlikely that the argument which gives us the annihilation of the British of the British Isles, may also give us that of the Gallic of Gaul. Why should Armorica have been more Celtic than Wales? Yet, if it were not so, whence came the Armorican of Wales? I throw out these objections for the sake of stimulating criticism, rather than with the view of settling a by no means easy question.

KELÆNONESIA.

The dates of the four papers on this part of the world shew that the first preceeded the earliest of the other three by as much as four years; a fact that must be borne in mind when the philological ethnography of New Guinea and the islands to the south and east of it is under notice. The vocabularies of each of the authors illustrated in papers 2 and 3, more than doubled our previous data — Jukes' illustrating the language of islands between New Guinea and Australia, Macgillivray's those of the Louisiade Archipelago.

That there was a hypothesis at the bottom of No. I is evident. Neither is there much doubt as to the fact of that hypothesis being wrong.

I held in 1843 that, all over Oceania, there was an older population of ruder manners, and darker colour than the Malays, the proper Polynesians, and the populations allied to them; that, in proportion as these latter overspread the several islands of their present occupancy the aborigines were driven towards the interior; that in Australia, Tasmania, New Guinea &c. the original black race remained unmolested.

This view led to two presumptions; — both inaccurate;

1. That the ruder tribes were, *as such*, likely to be Negrito;
2. That the Negrito tongues would be allied to each other.

The view, held by me now, will be given in a future notice.

ON THE NEGRITO LANGUAGES.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

FEBRUARY 10, 1843.

By the term Negrito is meant those tribes of the Asiatic and Australian islands, who, in one or more of their physical characters, depart from the type of the nations in their neighbourhood and approach that of the African. The word is more comprehensive than Arafura, Andaman, or Papuan, and less comprehensive than Negro.

Of the Negrito localities the most western are —

The Andaman Islands. — A Vocabulary, collected by Lieutenant R. H. Colebrooke, appears in the Asiatic Researches, vol. iv. p. 410. The native name is Mincopie. An historical notice of them appears as early as the ninth century, in the Travels of the Two Arabians, translated by Renaudot.

The Nicobar and Carnicobar Islands. — In the largest of these it is stated that, in the interior, blacks are to be found. The current assertion concerning the language of the rest of these islands is, that the Carnicobar is Peguan, and the Nicobar Malay. — Asiatic Researches, iii. 303.

Malacca. — The Samangs of the interior are Negrito. For the single Vocabulary of their language, see Crawfurd's Indian Archipelago, or Klaproth's Nouveau Journal Asiatique, xii. 239, where Crawfurd's Vocabularly is reprinted without acknowledgement. The Orang Benua are *not* Negrito; neither are the Jokong Negrito. For thirty words in the latter language, see Thomas Raffles in Asiatic Researches, xii. 109. In this list twelve words are shown by Raffles to be Malay, and Humboldt states the same of two more. The other sixteen may or may not be of Negrito origin. The Samangs are the Orang Udai. — Humboldt, *Über die Kawi-Sprache.*

Sumatra. — The Battas of Sumatra are Malay, not Negrito (Marsden's Sumatra, p. 203, and Rienzi's Oceanie, vol. i.).

The Sumatran of Parkinson's Journal (p. 198) is the Arabic of Acheen. The true Negritos of Sumatra seem to be,

1. The *Orang Cooboo.* — These are stated to be pretty numerous between Palembang and Jambee. — Marsden's Sumatra, p. 35.

2. *The Orang Googoo*, — who are described by the Sumatrans of Laboon as being more Orang Utang than man. — Marsden's Sumatra, p. 35. Specimens of the Orang Googoo (Gougon) Rienzi states to have seen. He says that they come from Palembang and Menangcaboo, and he calls them Pithecomorphi.

For an historical notice as early as 960 A. D., probably referring to the Blacks of Sumatra, see Klaproth in Nouveau Journal Asiatique, xii. 239.

Borneo. — The Biajuk of Borneo is not Negrito but Malay (Crawfurd's Indian Archipelago); neither are the Dyacks Negrito. The statement of Marsden and Leyden is, that the Dyacks are *whiter* than the rest of the natives of Borneo; and the remark of more than one voyager is, that the Dyacks of Borneo look like South Sea Islanders in the midst of a darker population. Are the Marut, Idongs, Tidongs, or Tirungs of the north of Borneo Negrito? In Rienzi's Oceanie there is a Borneo Vocabulary which is headed Dyack, Marut and Idaan, the three terms being treated as synonyms. Of this Vocabulary all the words are Malay. That there are Negritos in Borneo is most probable, but of their language we possess but one word, *apün*, father* (and that more than doubtful); whilst of their name we know nothing; and in respect to their locality, we have only the statement of Kollf, that in the north of Borneo Blacks are to be found on the Keeneebaloo mountain; a statement, however, slightly modified by the fact of his calling them Idaans or Maruts (see Earl's translation of the Voyage of the Doorga, p. 417). Compare the name Idaan in Borneo, with the name Orang Udai, applied to certain rude tribes in Malacca.

The Sooloo Islands. — There are positive statements that the Sooloos contain Negritos. They also contain Malays; as may be seen in a Sooloo vocabulary in Rienzi's Oceanie, vol. i.

The Manillas. — The Isola de Negros testifies its population by its name. Hervas calls it the Papua of the Philippines. In Panay are the blackest of the Philippine Negritos. Rienzi would term them Melanopygmæi. In Bohol, Leyté and Samar, there are Negritos (Lafond Lurcy, ii. 182.); also in

* Mithr. i. 598.

Cayagan (Lafond Lurcy, ii. 182.); also in Capul or Abac (Hervas). For the two main islands there are, — 1st. In Mindanao, two wild tribes inhabiting the interior, the Bantschilen and the Hillunas. The proof of these two tribes being Negrito is the strongest for the Hillunas. They are the Negros del Monte of the Spaniards (Hervas, Catalogo delle Lingue; Adelung, i. 601). Near Marivèles are the Igorots or Ætas (Agtas of Hervas); and of these we have late and positive evidence, first to the fact of their being Negrito, and next to the difference of their language from the Tagal. — (Lafond Lurcy.) Secondly, in Luçon, the Zambalen of Adelung are Negrito. These are the Blacks of Pampango. The Blacks inhabiting the other parts of the island are called Ygelots; and Mount St. Mathew, near Manilla, is one of their well-known localities, and the Illoco mountains another. Here they were visited by Lafond Lurcy. They were all alike, and all under four feet six (French measure). Italonen, Calingas, and Maitim are the names under which the Philippine Blacks have been generally described. Agta and Maitim are said to be indigenous appellations. — Hervas.

Formosa. — The Formosan language is Malay. In the interior, however, are, according to the Chinese accounts, — 1, the Thoufan; 2, the Kia-lao; 3. the Chan tchaó chan; 4, the Lang Khiao, — aboriginal tribes with Negrito characters, each speaking a peculiar dialect. — Klaproth, Recherches Asiatiques.

The Loochoo Islands. — The current Loochoo language is Japanese (Klaproth, Rech. Asiat.). But besides this, Adelung mentions from Père Gaubil and Gosier, that three other languages are spoken in the interior, neither Japanese nor Chinese; and we are now, perhaps, justified in considering that, in these quarters, the fact of a language being aboriginal, is *primâ facie* evidence of its being Negrito.

Java. — Here the evidence of an aboriginal population at all is equivocal, and that of Negrito aborigines wholly absent. For the Kalangs, see Raffles's History of Java. The dark complexions on the island Bali show the darkness, not of the Negrito, but of the Hindoo; such at least is the view of Raffles opposed to that of Adelung (Mith. i.). There is no notice of Blacks in Ende (otherwise Floris), in Sumbawa, or in Sandalwood Island.

Savoo. — If the Savoo of modern geographers be the Pulo Sabatu of Dampier, then there were, in Dampier's time, Blacks in Savoo. The Savoo of Parkinson's Journal is Malay.

Timor. — In this island Negritos were indicated by Peron.

Freycinet describes them. Lafond Lurcy had a Timor black as a slave. Of their language he gives four words: — *manouc*, bird; *vavi*, woman; *lima*, five; *ampou*, ten. All these are Malay.

Ombay. — In Freycinet's Voyage the natives of Ombay are described as having olive-black complexions, flattened noses, thick lips, and long black hair. In Arago * we find a short vocabulary, of which a few words are Malay, whilst the rest are unlike anything either in the neighbouring language of Timor (at least as known by Raffles's specimens), or in any other language known to the author. Upon what grounds, unless it be their cannibalism, the Ombaians have been classed with the New Zealanders, is unknown. The evidence is certainly not taken from their language.

Between Timor and New Guinea we collect, either from positive statements or by inference, that, pure or mixed, there are Negritos in at least the following islands: — 1, Wetta; 2, Kissa?; 3, Serwatty?; 4, Lette?; 5, Moa?; 6, Roma?; 7, Damma; 8, Lakor?; 9, Luan; 10, Sermatta; 11, Baba; 12, Daai; 13, Serua; 14, the Eastern Arroos; 15, Borassi. (Kollf's Voy.; Earl's Translation.)

The language of the important island of Timor-Laut is Malay. From a conversation with the sailor Forbes, who was on the island for sixteen years, the author learned that there are in Timor-Laut plenty of black slaves, but no black aborigines.

Celebes. — In the centre of Celebes and in the north there are Negritos: the inhabitants call them Turajas, and also Arafuras: they speak a simple dialect and pass for aborigines. (Raffles, History of Java.) Of this language we have no specimen. Gaimard's Menada is the Menadu of Sir Stamford Raffles, and Raffles's Menadu is Malay. (Voyage de l'Astrolabe, Philologie, ii. 191.) The remark made by the collector of this Menadu Vocabulary was, that those who spoke it were *whiter* than the true Bugis, and that they looked like South-Sea Islanders, a fact of value in a theory of the Dyacks, but of no value in the enumeration of the Negritos.

Bourou, Gammen, Salawatty, Battenta. — For each of these islands we have positive statements as to the existence of Negritos.

Gilolo. — In Lesson's Natural History the inhabitans of Gilolo are classed with those of Gammen, Battenta, &c., as Negritos. The same is the case in the Mithridates, where the inference is, that in all the Moluccas, with the excep-

* Vide Note A.

tion of Amboyna and Ternati, Negritos are to be found in the interior. For Guebé see the sequel.

The Teetees. — The Teetee Islands of Meares, the Jauts or Acauw of the Mithridates, sixteen in number, are Negrito. (Meares, Voyage, Adelung.)

Oby. — According to Adelung this island is Negrito.

The object of what has gone before is less to state where Negritos are to be found than where they are to be looked for. Hence many of the above notices indicate the probable rather than the actual presence of them; and those statements concerning the Molucca localities that are taken from systematic books (and as such at secondhand) are all subject to one exception, viz. the fact that the tribes described as Arafura, although in current language Negrito, are not necessarily so. An instance of this has been seen in the so-called Arafura of Menadu. The same applies to the so-called Arafura of Ceram, (Handboek der Land-en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië. P. P. Roorda van Eysinga. Amsterdam 1841; indicated by Mr. Garnett,) which is Malay. In the quarters about to be given in detail the evidence is less exceptionable.

New Guinea. — Here there is little except Negritos; and here we meet with the name *Papua*. What is said of the Papuas must be said with caution. Physical conformation being the evidence, there are in New Guinea two nations, if not more than two: — 1. Those of the North, with curly hair, which are subdivided into the pure Papuas, and the Papuas that are looked upon as a cross with the Malay (Quoy, Gaimard and Lesson in the French Voyages). 2. Those of the South, with lank hair, called by the French naturalists Arafuras. The author was unable to determine who were meant by the Alfakis of Quoy (Durville's Voyage, iv. 746). To the language of these Alfakis are possibly referable the ten words of Lesson. These are the numerals, and, they are as might be expected, Malay. For the South of New Guinea we not so much as a single vocabulary or a single word.

Waigioo. — The Waigioo and New Guinea have been frequently confounded; we have therefore deferred speaking of the latter until we could also deal with the former. Without going into the conflicting evidence, we may state that there are two Vocabularies wherein *arm* is *kapiani*, and three wherein *arm* is *bramine*. Of the first division we have — 1st, the Vocabularies of the Uranie and Physicienne Corvettes, under Freycinet, in 1817, 1818, 1819, as given in Arago's (the draughtsman's) Narrative, p. 275, English translation; and 2ndly, the Undetermined Vocabulary of Den-

trecasteaux. Dentrecasteaux, whilst at Boni in Waigioo, saw some strangers who spoke a language very different from the inhabitants of that island; he considered that they came from New Guinea. Now this language is the Waigioo of Arago*; whilst the Waigioo of Dentrecasteaux is the Papua of Arago. Among the Vocabularies of the second class we have Gaimard's Rawak Vocabulary, stated especially (Voyage de l'Astrolabe, Philologie, vol. ii. p. 153.) to have been collected at Rawak in Waigioo in 1818: here *arm* is *bramine*. Now a vocabulary (that will soon be mentioned) of the New Guinea Papuan of Port Dorey was collected during the expedition of the Astrolabe by the same naturalist, M. Gaimard. With this vocabulary Gaimard's Rawak coincides, rather than with Arago's Waigioo and Dentrecasteaux's Undetermined Vocabulary. This makes the third vocabulary for these islands. The fourth is Gaimard's Port Dorey Vocabulary (Voyage de l'Astrolabe, Philologie, ii. 146.). The fifth, Dentrecasteaux's (or La Billardière) Waigioo Vocabulary. This represents the same language as those last-mentioned, inasmuch as in it *arm* is *bramine* not *kapiani*. The sixth vocabulary is the Utanata, from Dutch authorities (vide Trans. Geogr. Soc.). This akin to the Lobo Vocabulary. — Ibid. The next is Forest's Vocabulary. See Forest's Voyage to New Guinea. Such are the data for New Guinea and Waigioo. Dalrymple's Vocabulary will be noticed in the sequel.

Guebé. — The Guebé Vocabulary of the Astrolabe (Philologie, ii. 157) is the Guebé of Freycinet's Voyage in 1818, when it was collected by Gaimard. The Guebé of Arago (under Freycinet) also approaches the Guebé of Gaimard. According to D. Durville the Guebé is Papuan. The author however considers it Malay, though there was some resemblance to the Papuan, inasmuch as many Malay terms were common to both these dialects.

From New Guinea westward and southward the Negritos are no longer isolated. The following are Negrito Islands, or Negrito Archipelagos: —

1. New Britain; 2. New Hanover; 3. New Ireland; 4. Solomon's Islands; 5. Queen Charlotte's Archipelago; 6. Louisiade Archipelago; 7. Isles of Bougainville; 8. Bouka; 9. New Georgia; 10. Admirality Isles, — York, Sandwich, Portland; 11. Santa Cruz Archipelago; 12. Arsacides; 13. Espiritu Santo, or New Hebrides, — Mallicollo, Erromango, Tanna, Erronan, Annatom; 14. New Caledonia; 15. Warouka, Bligh's

* See Note B.

and Banks's Island. — Astrolabe. The Ticopian is not Negrito but Polynesian. — Voyage de l'Astrolabe.

Fiji Islands. — In the Fiji Islands the physical character of the natives is half Negrito and half Polynesian. Here is the Negrito limit to the east; that is, of Negrito tribes as existing at the present moment.

The languages of the list just given are known to us through the following Vocabularies.

New Ireland &c. — Gaimard's Carteret Harbour Vocabulary. — Voyage de l'Astrolabe, Philologie, ii. 143.

Durville's Port Praslin Vocabulary, incorporated with Gaimard's Carteret Bay Vocabulary. — Ibid.

Dalrymple's so-called New Guinea Vocabulary. The word *so-called* was used because, unless there were natives of New Ireland on the coast of New Guinea, Dalrymple's Vocabulary is a representative of the Papuan. It coincides with those of Durville and Gaimard from New Ireland: it was collected by Schouten and Le Maire. It is also the New Guinea of De Brosses.

Vocabularies of four small islands are given by Dalrymple and De Brosses, viz. of Moses Island, Moa, Hoorn Island, and Cocos Island. These are the vocabularies of Reland (Diss. xi.), referred to by Adelung.

Manicolo. — In Queen Charlotte's Archipelago, or perhaps among the Solomon Islands, lies an island in name resembling one of the New Hebrides. Durville called it Vanikoro, but Captain Dillon assures me that the true name is Manicolo. Of the language spoken here we have a vocabulary collected by Gaimard in three dialects; the Vanikoro, the Tanema, and the Taneanou. Voyage de l'Astrolabe, Philologie, ii. 164.

Mallicollo. — Cook's Island is Mallicollo. A glossary occurs in Cook's Voyages.

Tanna. — A single vocabulary in Cook's Voyages.

New Caledonia. — A short vocabulary in Cook. A longer one in Dentrecasteaux and La Billardière.

Of the Fiji we have a few words by Cook, a long vocabulary by Gaimard (Astrol. Phil. ii. 136), Port regulations, and MS. Scripture translations, which afford us full and sufficient samples of the language. To deal with this as Negrito the Polynesian element must be eliminated.

In the way of Ethnography Madagascar is Asiatic; since its language, as has been known since the time of Reland, is Malay. For this island the evidence of physical character gives two or more races, but the evidence of language only one.

Australia. — In this island we have vocabularies for the following localities: (1.) Murray Island; (2.) Caledon Bay; (3. 4.) Endeavour River; (5.) the Burrah Burrah tribe; (6.) Limestone Creek; (7.) Port Macquarie; (8.) Port Jackson; (9.) Menero Downs; (10.) Jervis Bay; (11.) Hunter's River, *vide* Threlkeld's Grammar; (12, 13, 14, 15.) Adelaide, — one of these being Teichelmann's and Schürmann's Grammar; (16.) Gulf St. Vincent; (17, 18, 19, 20.) King George's Sound; (22.) Grey's Vocabulary; and a few others.

Van Diemen's Land. — Here, as in Australia, everything is Negrito. In the way of Vocabularies, we have for the North, — (1.) Gaimard's Port Dalrymple Vocabulary, taken down from the mouth of a Van Diemen's Land woman at King George's Sound, with an Englishman as an interpreter. — Voy. Astr. Phil. ii. 9. In the South we have (2.) Cook's Vocabulary, collected in Adventure Bay, S. E. of Van Diemen's Land, — nine words. (3.) Dentrecasteaux's, or La Billardière's Vocabulary. (4.) Allan Cunningham's Vocabulary, collected in 1819 at Entrance Island. (5.) Dr. Lhotsky's Vocabulary, derived from Mr. M'Geary, and representing the language of Hobart's Town. — Journ. Geo. Soc. ix. Besides these, there is a Vocabulary procured by Mr. Robert Brown when in Australia. It nearly represents the same state of language as Dentrecasteaux's Vocabulary.

Besides these remarks, another class of facts should be indicated. In the south of Japan, and in the Marianne Isles, there are statements that Blacks *have been*: — Père Cantova (in Duperrey and Freycinet), and Adelung (Mithr. i.). From Rienzi also we learn a statement of Lütke's, viz. that in Pounipet, one of the Carolines, there are abundance of Blacks at this moment. These *may* by indigenous. The hypothetical presence of Negritos may account also for certain peculiarities of the Polynesian of the Tonga Islands. There are traces of them in the Navigator's Archipelago. Crozet (see Pritchard's Phys. Hist.) mentions Negritos in New Zealand, and Cook speaks to a tradition of aboriginal Negritos in Tahiti.

Such are the notices of the Oceanic Negritos in respect to their distribution and the amount of evidence afforded by the specimens of their language. The current opinion is, that over a certain area Blacks of a certain race or races were aborigines. This opinion there is no reason to disturb or to refine upon; the general question is as to the unity or the multiplicity of these races; but the more specific object of the present paper is to ascertain how far that question is decided by the comparison of their languages. The

safe way is to *ascend* in the classification, and to begin with determining the uniformity of speech over limited areas, and within natural boundaries. The most convenient locality to begin with is —

New Guinea. — That four out of the seven New Guinea Vocabularies (supposing them to have been collected independently of each other) represent either dialects of one language, or else languages closely allied, appears on the first comparison. These vocabularies are, — *a*) Gaimard's Rawak; *b*) Gaimard's Port Dorey; *c*) Arago's Papua; and *d*) Dentrecasteaux's Waigioo. To these Forest's Vocabulary (supposing always that his words have not been incorporated in the vocabularies that came after him) approaches more closely than to the other two.

English.	Forest.	Dentrecasteaux, &c.
fish	een	iené, *Malay?*
bird	moorsankeen	mazankéhéné.
man	sononman	snoné, *Malay?*
woman	binn	biéné, *Malay?*
fire	for	afor.
water	war	ouar, *Malay?*
sand	yean	iené.
house	rome	rouma, *Malay?*
hook	sofydine	sarfedinne.
sun	rass	riass.

Of the two remaining vocabularies the Lobo comes nearer to Forest than the Utanata does. Neither, however, coincide with Forest, as Forest coincides with the first four: nor yet do they coincide so closely with each other.

English.	Forest.	Lobo.
arrow	ekay	larakai.
bird	moorsankeen	manoc.
hog	ben	booi, *Malay?*
island	meossy	nusu.
sun	rass	orak.
tree	kaibus	akajuakar.
woman	binn	mawinna, *Malay?*
water	war	malar.
yes	io	oro.

English.	Forest.	Utanata.
bow	myay	amuré.
I	iya	area.
slave	omini	manoki.

English.	Forest.	Utanata.
tree	kaibus	kai, *wood.*
water	war	warani, *Malay?*
yes	io	aroa.

Again:

English.	Utanata.	Lobo.
basin	pigani	bingau.
cheeks	awamu	wafiwiriongo.
death	namata	namata, *Malay?*
drink (to)	nemuka	makinu, and also *eat.*
evening	jauw aroă	urwawa.
eyes	mamé	matatongo, *Malay?*
feathers	wiegu	wo eru, *Malay?*
great	napitteki	nabitteki.
hands	toe mare	nimango uta, *Malay?*
hog	oe	booi, *Malay?*
handsome	nata	nangewie.
here	aré	inairi.
head	oepauw	umun.
iron	puruti	wurusesi.
knife	tai	toeri, *for chopping.*
lemons	munda	munda.
little	mimiti	netie.
long	marawas	marawas.
lay (to)	aïkai	koekeimanse.
man	marowane	marowane.
mouth	irie	oriengo.
noon	kameti aroa	oertoto, *evening.*
plate	pigani	piring.
rain	komak	komak.
river	warari napeteki	walar nabetik, *water great.*
rope	warauw	waras.
sago	kinani	kakana.
slave	manoki	mooi.
seek	matigati	namitik.
speak (to)	iwari	iwar.
take away (to)	namatorani	motara.

New Ireland. — As far as we have vocabularies for evidence, the language of New Ireland is one.

English.	Port Praslin.	Carteret Bay.	Dalrymple.
beard	katissendi	kambissek	incambesser, *M.*
arms		limak	pongliman, *M.*
bananas		ounn	tachouner, *M.*

English.	Port Praslin.	Carteret Bay.	Dalrymple.
belly	balang		bala.
fish		siss	hissou.
fire	bia		eef.
forehead	poussou nourou		posson arong.
buttocks	kambali	kabalik	
back	ptarou	tarouk	
eye	matal	matak	*M.*
ear	pala tignai	pralenhek	
foot	pekendi	balankeki	kekeign.
finger	lima	oulimak	cateling liman.
hair	epiou	iouk	*M.*
iron	siner	siner	
neck	kindouroua	kondarouak	
nose	mboussou	kamboussouk	nisson.
shoulder	kamliman	kamlima	
tooth	ninissai	insik	ysangh, *M.*
water	moloum	maloum	*M.*
moon	calang		kalan.

For the affinities of the dialects of Moa, Moses Island, Cocos Island, Hoorn Island, to those of New Ireland, see Dalrymple's Island Voyages, *ad fin.* That the differences in Manicolo are those of dialect, may be seen from Gaimard's Vocabulary.

Australia. — That the Australian languages are one, at least in the way that the Indo-European languages are one, is likely from hence-forward to be admitted. Captain Grey's statement upon the subject is to be found in his work upon Australia. His special proof of the unity of the Australian language is amongst the unprinted papers of the Geographical Society. The opinions of Threlkeld and Teichelmann go the same way. The author's own statements are as follows: —

(1.) For the whole round of the coast there is, generally speaking, no vocabulary of sufficient length that, in some word or other, does not coincide with the vocabulary of the nearest point, the language of which is known to us. If it fail to do this it agrees with some of the remoter dialects. Flinder's Carpentarian, compared with the two vocabularies of the Endeavour River, has seventeen words in common. Of these, three (perhaps) four coincide. Eye, *meal*, C.; *meul*, E. R.: hair, *marra*, C.; *morye*, E. R.: fingers, *mingel*, C.; *mungal bah*, E. R.: breast, *gummur*, C.; *coyor*, E. R.

Endeavour River. — Two vocabularies. — Compared with

the vocabularies generally of Port Jackson, and the parts south and east of Port Jackson: — Eye, *meul*, E. R.; *milla*, L. C.: nose, *emurda*, E. R.; *morro*, L. C.: ears, *mulkah*, E. R.; *moko*, P. Macquarie: hair, *morye*, E. R.; *mundah*, B. B.: breast, *coyor*, E. R.; *kowul*, P. J.: fingers, *mungal bah*, E. R.; *maranga*, B. B.: elbow, *yeerwe*, E. R.; *yongra*, Menero Downs: nails, *kolke*, E. R.; *karungun*? P. J.: beard, *wollar*, E. R.; *walo*, Jervis's Bay; *wollak*, Port Maquarie. The number of words submitted to comparison was twenty-two.

Menero Downs (Lhotsky), and Adelaide (G. W. Earl).— Thirteen words in common, whereof two coincide.

hand	morangan, M. D.	murra, Adel.
tongue	talang,	taling.

Adelaide (G. W. Earl) and Gulf St. Vincent (Astrolabe).

beard	mutta, A.	molda, G. S. V.
ear	iri,	ioure,
foot	tinna,	tenna,
hair	yuka,	iouka,
hand	murrah,	malla,
leg	irako,	ierko,
nose	mula,	mudla,
teeth	tial,	ta.

Gulf St. Vincent (Astrolabe) and King George's Sound (Nind and Astrolabe); fifty words in common.

wood	kalla, G. S. V.	kokol, K. G. S.
mouth	ta,	taa,
hair	iouka,	tchao,
neck	mannouolt,	wolt,
finger	malla,	mal,
water	kawe,	kepe,
tongue	talein,	talen,
foot	tenna,	tchen,
stone	poure,	pore,
laugh	kanghin,	kaoner.

(2.) The vocabularies of distant points coincide; out of sixty words in common we have eight coincident.

English.	Jervis's Bay.	Gulf St. Vincent.
forehead	holo	ioullo.
man	mika	meio.

English.	Jervis's Bay.	Gulf St. Vincent.
milk	awanham	ammenhalo.
tongue	talen	talein.
hand	maramale	malla.
nipple	amgnann	amma.
black	mourak	pouilloul.
nails	berenou	pere.

(3.) The most isolated of the vocabularies, e. g. the Carpentarian, if compared with the remaining vocabularies, taken as a whole, has certain words to be found in different and distant parts of the island.

English.	Carpentarian.	
eye	mail	milla, L. C.
nose	hurroo	morro, L. C.

The following is a notice of certain words coinciding, though taken from dialects far separated:

lips	tambamba, Men. D.	tamande, G. S. V.	
star	jingi, ditto	tchindai, K. G. S.	
forehead	ullo, ditto	ioullo, G. S. V.	
beard	yernka, Adel.	arnga, nanga,	K. G. S.
bite	paiandi, ditto	badjeen,	ditto.
fire	gaadla, ditto	kaal,	ditto.
heart	karlto, ditto	koort,	ditto.
sun	tindo, ditto	djaat,	ditto.
tooth / *edge*	tia, ditto	dowal,	ditto.
water	kauwe, ditto	kowwin,	ditto.
stone	pure, ditto	boye,	ditto.

In the way of grammatical inflection we find indications of the same unity. We find also differences upon which we should be careful against laying too much stress. The inflection of the number is an instance of the difference. In South Australian — *tinyara*, a boy; *tinyarurla*, two boys; *tinyar-anna*, boys. In Western Australia — *yago*, a woman; *yago-mun*, women; *goolang*, a child; *goolang-gurrah*, children (*gurra*, many); *doorda*, a dog; *doorda-goodjal*, two dogs; *doorda boula*, many dogs (*boula*, many). Here there is a difference where we generally find agreement, viz. in the inflectional (or quasi-inflectional) expression of the numbers. The difference, however, is less real than apparent. The Australian is one of those languages (so valuable in general philology) where we find inflections in the act of forming,

and that from the agglutination not of affixes, suffixes and prefixes, but of words. In other terms, inflection is evolving itself out of composition. The true view then of different forms for the same idea is not that the inflections are unlike, but that the quasi-inflectional circumlocutions differ from each other in different dialects. There is no inflectional parallel between *two men* in English and *ἀνθρώπω* in Greek.

Van Diemen's Land, South. — For the south of Van Diemen's Land the language seems radically one. The following is what Cook has in common with Dentrecasteaux (or La Billardière) and Allan Cunningham.

English.	Cook.	1803.	D. C.	A. C.
woman.....	quadne	cuani	quani	
eye	evera	nubere	nubere.....	nammurruck.
nose.....	muidje	mugid.....	muigui.....	meoun.
ear	koidgi	cuengi-lia	cuegnilia vaigui ouagui	..... gounreek.

Lhotsky's Vocabulary stands more alone. With the Vocabulary of 1803 and Dentrecasteaux's Vocabulary, it has but three (or two) coincidences: — tongue, *mina* Lh.; *mene*, Voc. of 1803: water, *lugana*, Lh.; *lia*, Voc. 1803: drink, *lugana*, Lh.; *laina*, Voc. 1803. With Allan Cunningham's Vocabulary it has fourteen words in common and three coincident: — nose, *minerana*, Lh.; *meoun*, A. C.: tongue, *mina*, Lh.; *mim*, A. C.: fire, *lope*, Lh.; *lope*. A. C. Brown and Cunningham coincide a little more than Cunningham and Lhotsky. It is perhaps safe to say, that for the South of Van Diemen's Land the language, as represented by its vocabularies, is radically one.

Van Diemen's Land, North. — In Lhotsky's Vocabulary seven words are marked W, four E, and one S, as being peculiar to the western, eastern and southern parts of the island. One of the four words marked E is found in the Port Dalrymple Vocabulary, being the only word common to the two, *e. g.* wood, *mumanara*, E.; *moumra*, Port Dalrymple. The coincidence of the North and South is as follows: —

English.	Port Dalrymple.	Lhotsky.
ear	tiberatie	pitserata.
eye	elpina	lepina.
leg	langna	langana, *foot.*
hawk	gan henen henen.....	ingenana.
posteriors	wabrede	wabrede.

English.	Port Dalrymple.	Lhotsky.
man	lusuina	loondouenne.
night	livore	levira.
sea	legana	lugana, *fresh water.*
tooth	iane	yana.

English.	Port Dalrymple.	Brown & D. C.
belly	magueleni	lomongui.
bird	iola	oille.
kangaroo	taramei	tara.
lips	mona	mogudilia.
nose	medouer	mugid.
stone	lenn parene	loine.
tooth	iane	canan.
arms	regoula	rilia.

About thirty-five words are common to Lhotsky and the Vocabularies of Brown and Dentrecasteaux. From the foregoing observations we may conclude that for the whole of Van Diemen's Land (as far as represented by the Vocabularies) the language is radically one.

Such are the groups as spread over limited areas and confined within natural boundaries. The affinity of speech between different islands is another question.

Preliminary to this we must eliminate the Malay from the Negrito. The full knowledge that this has been done imperfectly invalidates all that we have arrived at; so that, once for all, it may be stated, that what is asserted respecting the amount of words common to two localities is asserted subject to the condition of their being true Negrito and not Malay.

Andaman and Samang. — Few words in common; one coincident, and that borrowed in all probability from a third language.

New Guinea and Waigioo. — By Waigioo is meant the Waigioo of Arago, and the Undetermined Vocabulary of Dentrecasteaux. They have about forty words in common, and the following are coincident: —

English.	Waigioo?	New Guinea?
hand	cocani, D.	konef.
belly	sgnani, A.	sneouar.
cheek	ganga foni, A.	gaiafoe.
breast	mansou, A.	soussou.
eyes	tagueni, D.	tadeni.
eyelids	inekarnei, A.	karneou.
foot	courgnai, A.	oekourae, *heel.*

English.	Waigioo?	New Guinea?
fire	clap, A.	ap, afor.
hair	senoumebouran, A.	sonebrahene.
knee	capugi, A.	one-pouer.
rain	mei, D.	meker.
sand	saine, D.	iene, *Malay.*
nose	sauny, D. soun, A.	soidon, *mouth.*
stuff (made of bark of tree)	male, D.	maran, *Malay.*

New Guinea and New Ireland. — Forest and Dalrymple: — fish, *een*, F.; *hissou*, D. Mal.: fire, *for*, F.; *eeff*, D. Mal.: sand, *yean*, F., *coon*, D.: sun, *ras*, F.; *nass*, D: star, *mak*, F.; *maemetia*, D. Dalrymple and Utanata. — Upwards of twenty-five words in common: — Earth, *taar*, D.; *tiri* Mal., Ut.: eat, *nam nam*, D.; *nemuka*, Ut.: tongue, *hermangh*, D.; *mare*, Ut. *Dalrymple and Lobo.* — About thirty words in common: — arms, *pongliman*, D.; *nimango*, Ut., Mal.: belly, *balang*, D.; *kanborongo*, Ut.: tongue, *hermangh*, D.; *kariongo*, Ut.

Port Praslin and Carteret Bay (taken together), and *Utanata and Lobo* (taken together). — For the sake of comparison, the whole of the words that the two (or four) Vocabularies have in common are exhibited, and by their side the equivalents in Latin and in Greek.

English.	Utan. Lob.	P. P. and C. B.	Latin.	Greek.
arm	nimango	limak	brachium	ὠλένη.
back			tergum	νῶτον.
belly	kan-borongo	bala	venter	γαστήρ.
beard			barba	πώγων.
bud	manok	mani	avis	ὄρνις.
breast			pectus	στῆθος.
black	ikoko	guiam	niger	μέλας.
cough	wouru	lou-koro	tussis	βήξ.
dog	wure	poul	canis	κύων.
dance			salio.	χορεύομαι.
eyes	matatongo	mata	oculus	ὄφθαλμος.
— *brows*	wura	pouli matandi	supercilium	ὀφρύς.
ear			auris	οὖς.
eat			edo	ἔσθίω.
fish			piscis	ἰχθύς.
foot	kaingo	balan keke	pes	ποῦς.
finger	nimango sori	lima	digitus	δάκτυλος.
fire			ignis	πῦρ.
great			magnus	μέγας.

English.	Utan. Lob.	P. P. and C. B.	Latin.	Greek.
hair			crinis	θρίξ.
hand			manus	χεῖρ.
hog	booi	bouri	porcus	χοῖρος.
head	oepauw	pouklouk	caput	κεφάλη.
knee	kairigo-woko	tangoulou kekendi / pougaigi	genu	γόνυ.
mouth			os	στόμα.
moon			luna	σελήνη.
neck			collum	τράχηλος.
nose			nasus	ῥίς.
no			non	οὐ.
red	napetiaro	tara	ruber	ἐρυθρός.
run			curro	τρέχω.
sugar-cane				
tongue	kariongo	kermea	lingua	γλῶσσα.
thigh			femur	μηρός.
teeth			dens	ὀδούς.
water	malar / waran	moloum	aqua	ὕδωρ.
yes	oro	io	imo	ναιχί.

With thirty-seven words in common, the two Negrito languages have seventeen coincident; with thirty-seven words in common, the two classical languages have nine coincident. The evidence, therefore, of the affinity of the Papua and New Ireland is stronger than of the Latin and Greek, as determined from identical *data*.

New Ireland and Manicolo. — The Port-Praslin and Carteret Bay Vocabularies being dealt with as one for New Ireland, and the three dialects being treated as one for Manicolo, we have, out of twenty-eight words in common, the following coinciding: — yes, *io*, P. P.; *io*, C. B.; *io*, Manic.: eye, *mata*, P. P.; *matak*, C. B.; *mala, maleo, mataeo*, Man., *Mal.:* banana, *ounn*, C. B.; *pounha, ounra, ounro*, Man., *Mal.:* canoe, *kouan*, C. B.; *naoure, goia, koure*, Manic., *Mal.:* tooth, *ninissai*, P. P.; *insik*, C. B.; *indje*, Tanean: testes, *puen*, P. P.; *boua bouinini, boua ini*, Man.: beard, *kam-bissek*, C. B. (*incam besser*, Dalr.); *oungoumie, vingoumie*, Man., *Mal.:* breast, *boroick*, C. B.; *berenhenham*, Man.; ear, *palalignai*, P. P.; *pralen*, C. B.; *manbalenhi*, Manic.; hair, *nihouge*, D.; *anaoko*, Man.

Manicolo and Mallicollo. — Eighteen words in common, the following coincident: — Bread-fruit, *baloe*, Man.; *barabe*, Mall.: cocoa-nut, *venoure*, Man.; *naroo*, Mall.: eye, *mataeo*, Man.; *maitang*, Mall., *Mal.:* ear, *tagnaini*, Man.: *talingan*, Mall., *Mal.:* bird, *menouka*, Man.; *moero*, Mall., *Mal.:* head, *batcha*, Man.;

basaine, Mall.: hog, *boi boi*, Man.; *brrooas*, Mall., *Mal.:* no, *tae*, Man.; *taep*, Mall.: water, *ouine*, Man.; *ergour*, Mall.: drink, *kanou*, *nanou*, Man.; *nooae*, Mall.

Mallicollo and Tanna. — Sixteen words in common: — cocoa-nuts, *naroo*, Mall.; *nabooy*, Tann.: drink, *noaee*, Mall.; *nooee*, Tann., *Mal.:* eye, *maitang*, Mall.; *manee maiuk*, Tann., *Mal.:* ears, *talingan*, Mall.; *feeneenguk*, Tann., *Mal.:* bird, *mŏeroo*, Mall.; *manoo*, Tann., *Mal.:* hog, *brrooas*, Mall.; *boogas*, Tann., Mal.: navel, *nemprtong*, Mall.; *napeerainguk*, Tann.: teeth, *reebohn*, *warrewuk*, Mall.; *raibuk*, Tann.; water, *ergour*, Mall.; *namawarain*, Tann.: woman, *rabin*, Mall.; *naibraan*, Tann., *Mal.*

Tanna and Mallicollo (taken together) *and New Caledonia.* — Neither with Mallicollo or Tanna alone, nor with Mallicollo and Tanna taken together, as compared with New Caledonia, do we find more words coincident than the following: — Cocoa-nut, *naroo*, M.; *nabooy*, T.; *neeoo*, N. Cal., *Mal.*: drink, *noaee*, M.; *nooee*, T.; *oondoo*, N. Cal.: head, *noognanaium*, T.; *garmoin* (Cook), *vangue*, (L. B.), N. Cal.: yams, *oofe*, Tann.; *oobe*, N. Cal., Mal.: yes, *eeo*, Tann.; *elo*, N. Cal.: no, *taep*, Mall.; *nda*, N. Cal.

Next in order comes the comparison between the Vocabularies of Van Diemen's Land and South Australia.

Port Dalrymple and King Georges Sound (*Nind and Astrol.*): — Wound, *barana*, P. D.; *bareuk*, N.: wood, *moumbra*, P. D.; *pourn*, N.: hair, *kide*, P. D.; *kaat*, N.: thigh, *degagta*, P. D.; *tawal*, N.: kangaroo, *taramei*, P. D.; *taamour*, N.: lips, *mona*, P. D.; *mele*, K. G. S.: no, *poutie*, P. D.; *poualt*, *poort*, K. G. S.: egg, *komeka*, P. D.; *kierkee*, K. G. S.: bone, *pnale*, P. D.; *nouil*, K. G. S. (bone of bird used to suck up water) N.: skin, *kidna*, P. D.; *kiao?* K. G. S.: two *katebouevе*, P. D.; *kadjen*, K. G. S. (N.). Fifty-six words in common.

Port Dalrymple and Gulf St. Vincent. — Mouth, *mona*, P. D.; *tamonde*, G. S. V. (a compound word, since *taa* is mouth, in K. G. S.): drink, *kible*, P. D.; *kawe*, G. S. V.: arm, *anme*, P. D.; *aondo* (also shoulder), G. S. V.: hawk, *gan henen henen*, P. D.; *nanno*, G. S. V.: hunger, *tigate*, P. D.; *takiou*, G. S. V.: head, *eloura*: P. D.; *ioullo*, G. S. V.: nose, *medouer**, P. D., *modla*, G. S. V.: bird, *iola*, *pallo*, G. S. V.: stone, *lenn parenne*, P. D.; *poure?* G. S. V.: foot, *dogna*, P. D.; *tenna*, G. S. V.: sun, *tegoura***, P. D.; *tendo*, G. S. V. Seventy words in common.

Port Dalrymple and Jervis's Bay. — Wound, *barana*, P. D.; *karanra*, J. B.: tooth, *iane*, P. D.; *ira*, J. B.: skin, *kidna*,

* Mula. ** Also Moon.

P. D.; *bagano*, J. B.: foot, *dogna*, P. D.; *tona**, J. B.: head, *eloura*, P. D.; *hollo*, J. B. Fifty-four words in common. What follows is a notice of some miscellaneous coincidences between the Van Diemen's Land and the Australian.

English.	Van Diemen's Land.	Australia.
ears	cuengilia, 1803	gundugeli, Men. D.
thigh	tula, Lh.	dara, Men. D.
stone	pure, Adel.; voye, K. G. S.	lenn parene, P. D.
breast	pinenana, Lh.	voyene, Men. D.
skin	kidna, P. D.	makundo, Teichelman.
day	megra, Lh.	nangeri, Men. D.
run	mella, Lh.	monri, Men. D.
feet	perre, D. C.	birre†.
little	bodenevoued, P. D.	baddoeen, Grey.
lip	mona, P. D.	tameno (*upper lip*), ditto.
egg	komeka, P. D.	muka, *egg, anything round*, Teichel.
tree	moumra, P. D.	worra (*forest*), Teichel.
mouth, *tongue*, *tooth*, *speak*	kamy, Cook.; kane, P. D.	kame (*speak.*, *mouth.*, *cry.*) J. B.
leg	darra, P. J.	lerai.
knee	gorook, ditto.	ronga, D. C.
moon	tegoura, P. D.	kakirra, Teichelman.
nose	medouer, P. D.	mudla, ditto.; moolya, Grey.
hawk	gan henen henen, P. D.	gargyre, ditto.
hunger	tegate, P. D.	taityo, Teichelman.
laugh	pigne, P. D.	mengk, Grey.
moon	vena, 1835.	yennadah, P. J.
day	megra, 1835.	karmarroo, ditto.
fire	une, 1803.	yong, ditto.
dew	manghelena, *rain*	menniemoolong.
water	boue lakade	neylucka, Murray, P. D.; bado, ditto.; lucka, Carpentarian.

Such is the similarity amongst the Negrito languages, as taken in their geographical sequence, and as divided into three groups. Between the Andaman and Samang there is no visible similarity or coincidence. From New Guinea to New Caledonia there is a series of coincidences; and there is also similarity between the Australian and Van Diemen's

* Tjenne, tidna, jeena. † Generally toe-nail.

Land. But it is far from following that, because languages will form groups when taken in geographical succession, they will also form groups when the sequence or succession shall be interrupted. Tested by another method there is an affinity as follows:

English.	Manicolo.	New Guinea.
arms	me, menini, maini	nimango, L., *Mal.*
belly	tchan-hane, tchaene	kanborongo, L. sgnani, W.
bow	ore	amure, Ut.
drink	canou	makinu, L. quinenne, A. } *Mal.*
eye	mala, mateo	mame, U.; matatongo, U., *Mal.*
sun	ouioia	jauw, U.
tongue	mia, mimeaeo	mare, Ut.
woman	venime, vignivi	mawina, L. viene, A. } *Mal.*
yes	io	aroa, U., oro, L.
ear	tagnaini, ragnengo	kanik, kananie, A. tantougni, W. } *Mal.*
fish	ane, gniene	iene, A., *Mal.*
nose	n-hele	nony, A.
water	ouire	ouara, A., *Mal.* war, F.
teeth	ongne	oualini, analini, W.
shoulders	outalen-buien-hane	poupouni, *Waig.*

English.	New Caledonia.	New Ireland.
ant	kinki	akan, P. P.
tooth	inouan	insik, C. B., *Mal.*
birth	manou	mane, C. B., *Mal.*
cheeks	poangue	paring, D.
eyebrows	poutchie-banghie	pouli-matandi, P. P.
fire	afi, hiepp	bia.
foot	bakatiengue	kekeign, D. balankeke, C. P.
knees	bangueligha	pougaigi, P. P.
tongue	coubmeigha, coumean	kermea.
moon	ndan	kalan, P. P.
walk	ouanem	inan.
rain	oda	ous, D., *Mal.*
nose	mandee	mboussou, P. P.
sleep	kingo	heim, D.
black	ganne	guiam.
sun	niangat	naas, D.

English.	New Caledonia.	New Ireland.
navel	padan-bourigne, pamboran	pouta, P. P., *Mal.*
sea	dene	dan (*water*), D., *Mal.*
weep	ngot	ignek, C. B.

English.	New Caledonia.	Manicolo.
back	donnha	dienhane diene.
ear	guening	ragnengo.
good	kapareick	kapai.
head	bangue	batcha.
moon	manoc	mele.
no	nda	taie.
testes	quienbeigha	bona.
	yabingue	bouenini.
water	oe	ouire, *Mal.*

English.	New Caledonia, D. C.	Waigioo, D. C., &c.
ear	guening	guenani.
fish	ica	icanne, *Mal.*
teeth	inouan	analiné, Undeterminded, D.C.

Notwithstanding doubtful words certain, it seems that there is evidence of the most unlike of the languages between Waigioo and New Caledonia (inclusive) being not more unlike than the most dissimilar of the Indo-European tongues. That this statement may be enlarged seems probable by the following parallels:—

feet	perre, V. D. L. perelia (*nails*), do.		petiran, C. B.
beard	kongine, V. D. L.		gangapouni, *Waig.* yenga, *Mal.*
bird	mouta, V. D. L.		manouk, *Mal.*
chin	kamnena, V. D. L.		gambape, *Waig.*
eye	meul, Austr		matta, *Pap.* and *Mal.*
tooth	canan iane yane	V. D. L.	gani, *mouth*, *Waig.*, D. insik, *teeth*, P. P., *Mal.*
forehead	caberra, Port Jackson		kabrani, *Waig.*
sand	gune, V. D. L.		coon, yean.
wood *tree*	gui, V. D. L.		kaibus, *Pap.* and *Mal.*
hair	yoka rouka	Australia	nihouge, New Ir.
sun	jinji	Australia	niangat, N. C.
star	tchindai		
ear	koyge, V. D. L.		gaaineng, N. C.

English.	Van Diemen's Land, D. C. L. B.	New Caledonia, D.C., L. B.
mouth	mougui	wangue and mouanguia.
arm	houana, gouna	pingue.
shoulders	bagny / baguy	bouheigha.
fire	nuba	afi, hiepp, nap, *Mal.*
knees	rangalia / rouga	banguiligha.
dead	mata	mackie.
no	neudi	nola.
ears	cuegni-lia	guening.
nails	pereloigni	pihingui.
hair	pelilogueni	bouling, poun ingue.
teeth	pegui	penoungha. / paou wangue.
fingers	beguia	badouheigha.
nose	mongui	mandee, vanding.
sleep	makunya	kingo.

English.	Andaman.	Miscellaneous.
ear	quaka	cuengi, V. D. L. / gueening, N. C.
hand	gonie	gong, Aust., or V. D. L.
mouth	morna	mona, V. D. L.
nose	mellee	mudla / medouer — V. D. L.
sun	ahay	jauw, Utan.
thighs	poye	pengue paan, N. C.
wood	kiante	tanghee, N. C.

The author concluded his paper with the following observations: —

1. For all that is known to the contrary, the Negrito tongues of Sumatra, Borneo, Timor, the Moluccas, Formosa and several smaller islands of whose languages we have no specimens, may be in any relation whatever to any other language, and to each other.

2. The Andamanee and Samang may be in any relation to any other Negrito tongue, or to each other, beyond that of mere dialect.

3. The languages hitherto known of New Guinea, New Ireland, the Solomon's Isles, New Caledonia, Tanna, and Mallicollo, are related to each other, *at least* as the most different languages of the Indo-European tribe are related.

4. The known languages of Australian are related to each other, *at least* in the same degree.

5. The Van Diemen's Land and Australian are similarly related.

6. Classified in divisions equally general with the Indo-European, the Negrito dialects (as far as they are known by their vocabularies) cannot fall into more than four, and may possibly be reducible to one; the data being up to a certain point sufficient to determine radical affinities, but nowhere sufficient to determine radical differences.

7. The ethnographical division, according to physical conformation, coincides with the ethnographical division according to language, only so far as the former avoids the details of classification. With the minute subdivisions of the French naturalists the latter coincides least.

8. The distinction between the Negritos and the Malays seems less broad when determined by the test of language, than it does when measured by physical conformation.

9. The notion of the hybridism of the Papuas, arising from the view of their physical conformation, is in a degree confirmed by the nature of their language; although even the physical evidence is not absolute, *i. e.* on a par with that respecting the hybridism of the Griquas and Confusos.

10. With two* (if not more) Negrito tribes, whereof the evidence of language is wholly wanting, physiological differences indicate a probability of difference of language, equal to the difference between any two Negrito languages of which we have specimens.

11. Even in the physiological classifications we are far from being sure that the whole number of Negrito tribes has been discribed.

---

* The Blacks of the Philippines and the Blacks of the South of New Guinea.

NOTE A.

ENGLISH.	OMBAY. *Arago.*	NEW ZEALAND. *Astrolabe.*	MALAY. *Astrolabe.*	TICOPIA. *Astrolabe.*	TIMOR. *Raffles.*	SAVOO. *Parkinson.*
nose	imouni	hihiou	idong	issou	enur	swanga.
eyes	inirko	kanohi	mata	mata	mata	madda.
head	imocila	kadou, oupoko...	kapala	ordou	ulu	katow.
mouth	ibirka	mangai	moulout	nhoutou	——	lara voulou.
teeth	vessi	niho	guiguit	nifo	nehan	——
chin	irakata	kouai	djengot	kaoue	——	pagave.
hair	inibatalaga	oudou	rambout	raoulou	——	row.
ear	iverlaka	taringa	kouping	tarinha	——	coodelou.
neck	tameni	?kaki	tengkok	teoua	——	lacoco.
breast	tercod	ouma	dada	ou	——	——
belly	*tekapana	kopore	prout	mimi, laha	kabon	duloo.
posteriors	tissoukou	——	——	——	——	voorai.
pudendum	glessi	——	——	——	——	——
bosom	ami	ou	pankou	fata fata	——	sousou.
shoulders	iklessine	poko iwi	bahou	touaga pakaou...	——	kooloogoono.
arm	ibarana	——	——	——	——	——
hand	ouine	dinga	tanghau	rima	——	wulaba.
finger	tetenkilei	——	——	——	——	——
thumb	setenkoubassi ...	koro-matoua	djempol	maikao	——	——
thigh	itêna	owha	paha	faci	——	tooga.
leg	irnka	wae wae	vetis	vae	——	aen-vaibo.
knee	icicibouka	touri	loukout	poko touri	——	routou.
foot	makalata	——	kaki	vai	——	dureala.
tail	imbilitaka	ikou	bountot.	——	——	——
bow	mossa	——	——	ten hassaou	——	——
arrow	dota	——	pana	fana	——	——
knife	pisso	koti koti	pissau	koffe	——	bussee, *iron.*

* Kibou, Mad., opou, Owhywhee.

NOTE B.

arm	kapiani, A.; capiani, D.
buttock	seni and senidokaouri, A.; tiangapoui, D.
belly	sgnani, A.; iani, D.
back	kouaneteni, A.; cateni, D.
chin	gambapi, A.; capapi, D.
dugs	mansou, A.; sou (*bosom*), D.
eyes	jadjiemouri, A.; taguini, D.
fingers	cantoulili, D.
— *fore*	konkant-ili, A.
— *middle*	kouanti-poulo, A.
— *ring*	kouanti-ripali, A.
— *little*	kouanti-lminki, A.
foot	kourgnai, A.; caloani, D.
hair	sénoumébouran, A.; pia, D.
hand	konk-afaleni, A.; cocani, D.
heel	konk abiouli, A.
knee	konk-apoki, A.; capougui, D.
leg	konkanfai, A.; anga fuini, D.
nose	soun, A.; sauny, D.
nails	cambrene, A.; cabrene, D.
teeth	oualini, A.; analini, D.
toe, great	kouanti-hel, A.
—, *second and fourth*	kouanti-bipali, A.
—, *third*	kouanti-poulo, A.
—, *little*	kouanti-lminki, A.
thigh	affoloni, A.; enfoloni, or anfoloni, D.

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA (1859).

Andaman — The *Andaman* Language is monosyllabic, and allied to the Burmese of the opposite continent.

Nicoaar &c. — The statement that there are Blacks in the *Nicobar Islands* is inaccurate. The tribes further from the coast are the rudest. In the Nicobar vocabulary of the Voyage of the Galathea (*Steen Bille — Galathea's Reise omkring Jorden*), the language most especially represented is that of the island Terressa; the words from Nancovry being marked *N*, and those from Cariecobar *C. N.* No difference, beyond that of dialect, is recognized as existing between them. At the same time it is, by no means, certain, that every form of speech belonging to the Archipelago is known to us.

Samang &c. — The statement that these are the Orang Udai is inaccurate. For further notice of the Samang see Newbold's Indian

Archipelago; a work not known to me when my paper was written. The ethnology of the Orang Benua is fully illustrated in the Journal of the Indian Archipelago. They are all Malay.

Sumatra. — This island gives us certain tribes ruder than others — not blacker; at any rate no Negritos.

The same applies to *Borneo;* where there is plenty of barbarism but nothing Negrito.

The same to the *Sulu* Archipelago.

The *Manillas.* — Specimens of four of the so-called Negrito languages are to be found in Steen Bille's Voyage of the Galathea (Vol. III.); headed, (1) Umiray, (2) St. Miguel; (3) St. Matheo and (4) Dumagat. They evidently belong to the same group as the Tagal.

Formosa and Loocho. — The criticism that applies to Borneo and the Sulu Archipelago applies here.

For *Timor*, *Ombay* &c. see the next paper.

The language of the *Arru* islanders is not mentioned; indeed in 1843 no specimens of their language had been published. Since, however, a good account of them has been given by Windsor Earl. Their language contains much in common with the languages of the islands to the west of them, whilst in physical appearance they approach the Papuans. They present, in short, transitional characters — *Journal of Indian Archipelago*, *and The Papua Races.*

New Britain &c. — For Louisiade forms of speech see the next paper but one; for those of New Caledonia &c. see the fourth.

The Fijis. — The language of the Fijis is Polynesian.

Cocos Island. — The vocabulary of the island so-named seems to me to be that of Ticopia; and, as such, anything but Negrito.

In Braim's Australia we find specimens of five *Tasmanian* forms of speech. The additions to the philology of Australia since 1843 are too numerous to find place in a notice like the present. The fundamental unity of all the languages of that continent is, now, generally recognized.

Of the *Micronesian* Islanders (natives of the *Marianne* and *Caroline* Archipelagos) some tribes are darker than others. They chiefly occupy the coral, as opposed to the volcanic, formations. The same is the case with the supposed Negritos of Polynesia.

ON THE GENERAL AFFINITIES

OF THE

LANGUAGES OF THE OCEANIC BLACKS.

APPENDIX TO JUKES'S VOYAGE OF HMS FLY.

1847.

For philological purposes it is convenient to arrange the Blacks of the Asiatic and Oceanic Islands under five divisions.

1. The Blacks of the Andaman Islands. — These are, comparatively speaking, isolated in their geographical position; whilst the portion of the continent nearest to them is inhabited by races speaking a monosyllabic language.

II. The Blacks of the Malay area. — With the exception of Java, all the larger, and many of the smaller Malay Islands, as well as the Peninsula of Malacca, are described as containing, in different proportions, a population which departs from the Malay type, which approaches that of the Negro, which possesses a lower civilization, which generally inhabits the more inaccessible parts of the respective countries, and which wears the appearance of being aboriginal to the true Malay population. These tribes may be called the Blacks of the Malay area.

III. The Papuan Blacks of New Guinea. — Under this head may be arranged the tribes of New Guinea, New Ireland, the New Hebrides, Tanna, Erromango, Annatom, New Caledonia, &c.

IV. The Blacks of Australia.

V. The Tasmanian Blacks or the Blacks of Van Diemen's Land.

I. The Andaman Blacks will not be considered in the present note.

II. With respect to the languages of the Blacks of the Malay area, it may be stated unequivocally, that the dia-

lects of each and every tribe for which a vocabulary has been examined, are Malay.

A. Such is the case with the Samang, Jooroo, and Jokong vocabularies of the Peninsula of Malacca. — See Craufurd's Indian Archipelago, Asiatic Researches, xii. 109, Newbold's British Settlements in Malacca.

B. Such is the case with every vocabulary that has been brought from Sumatra. The particular tribe sufficiently different from the Malay to speak a different language has yet to be found.

C. Such is the case with the eight vocabularies furnished by Mr. Brooke from Borneo; notwithstanding the fact that both the Dyacks and the Biajuks have been described as tribes wilder and more degraded than the Malay: in other words, as tribes on the Negro side of the dominant population.

D. Such is the case with every vocabulary brought from any of the Molucca, Key, Arru, or Timorian Islands whatsoever; no matter how dark may be the complexion, or how abnormal the hair, of the natives who have supplied it.

E. Such is the case with the so-called Arafura vocabularies of Dumont Durville from Celebes, and of Roorda van Eysinga from Amboyna and Ceram.

F. Such is the case with the languages of the Philippine Islands. In no part of the great Malay area has the difference between the higher and lower varieties of the population, been more strongly insisted on, and more accurately explained than here. Yet the testimony of the early Spanish Missionaries, as to the fundamental identity of the Black with the other languages is unanimous; and, to put the matter further beyond doubt, the few words of the Igorot negroes, near Marivèles, which are supplied by Lafond Luray, who visited them, are Malay also.

Now, on these grounds, and laying the Andaman Islands out of the question, it may be safely predicated, that, until we reach either New Guinea, or Australia, we have no proofs of the existence of any language fundamentally different from the Malay; whatever may be the difference in physical appearance of those who speak it.

III. For New Guinea, and the islands Waigioo, and Guebé, I have found only ten short vocabularies, and these only for the north-western districts. One of these, the Guebé, of the voyage of the Astrolabe, although dealt with by Mr. Durville as Papuán, is Malay. The rest, without any exception, have a sufficient portion of Malay words to preclude any argument in favour of their belonging to a fresh class

of languages. On the other hand, the commercial intercourse between the Papuans and Malays precludes any positive statements as to the existence of a true philological affinity.

From New Guinea, westward and southward, we have for the localities inhabited by the black tribes with curly hair, the following vocabularies.

1. For New Ireland.

A. Gaimard's Carteret Harbour Vocabulary — Voyage de l'Astrolabe, Philologie, ii. 143.

B. Durville's Port Praslin Vocabulary. Ibid.

C. Dalrymple's, so called, New Guinea Vocabulary, collected by Schouten and Le Maire, given also by De Brosses.

2. For Vanikoro — Gaimard's Vocabulary in three dialects, the Vanikoro, the Tanema, and the Taneanou — Voyage de l'Astrolabe, Philologie, ii. 164.

3. Mallicollo — Cook's Vocabulary.

4. Tanna — Ditto. Also a few words marked G. Bennet, in Marsden's Miscellaneous Works.

5. Erromango — a few words by Bennet, in Marsden.

6. Annatom — Ditto.

7. New Caledonia — A short Vocabulary in Cook. A longer one in Dentrecasteaux and La Billardiere.

All these languages, although mutually unintelligible, exhibit words common to one another, common to themselves and the New Guinea, and common to themselves and the Malay. See Transactions of the Philological Society, vol. i. no.* 4.

IV. The Blacks of Australia are generally separated by strong lines of demarcation from the Blacks of New Guinea, and from the Malays. Even on the philological side of the question, Marsden has written as follows — "We have rarely met with any negrito language in which many corrupt Polynesian words might not be detected. In those of New Holland or Australia, such a mixture is not found. Among them no foreign terms that connect them with the languages even of other *papua* or negrito countries can be discovered; with regard to the physical qualities of the natives it is nearly superfluous to state, that they are negritos of the more decided class." — *p.* 71.

In respect to this statement, I am not aware that any recent philologist has gone over the *data* as we *now* have them, with sufficient care to enable him either to verify or to refute it. Nevertheless, the isolation of the Australian languages is a current doctrine.

* This is the preceding paper. (1859).

I believe this doctrine to be incorrect; and I am sure that, in many cases, it is founded on incorrect principles.

Grammatical differences are valued too high; glossarial affinities too low. The relative value of the grammatical and glossarial tests is not constant. It is different for different languages.

In 1844, I stated, at York, that from three true Malay localities, and in three true Malay vocabularies, I had found Australian and Tasmanian and Papuan words, viz:—

1. In the Timboran dialect of the Sumbawan.
2. In the Mangerei dialect of Flores.
3. In the Ombayan of Ombay.

1. Arm = *ibarana*, Ombay; *porene*, Pine Gorine dialect of Australia.

2. Hand = *ouiue*, Ombay; *hingue*, New Caledonia.

3. Nose = *imouni*, Ombay; *maninya*, *mandeg*, *mandeinne*, New Caledonia; *mena*, Van Diemen's Land, western dialect; *mini*, Mangerei: *meoun*, *muidge*, *mugui*, Macquarie Harbour.

4. Head = *imocila*, Ombay; *moos*, (= hair) Darnley Island; *moochi*, (= hair) Massied; *immoos*, (= beard) Darnley Islands; *ceta moochi*, (= beard) Massied.

5. Knee = *icici-bouka*, Ombay; *bowka*, *boulkay* (= forefinger) Darnley Islands.

6. Leg = *iraka*, Ombay; *horag-nata*, Jhongworong dialect of the Australian.

7. Bosom = *ami*, Ombay; *naem*, Darnley Island.

8. Thigh = *itena*, Ombay; *tinna-mook* (= foot) Witouro dialect of Australian. The root, *tin*, is very general throughout Australia in the sense of *foot*.

9. Belly = *te-kap-ana*, Ombay; *coopoi*, (= navel) Darnley Island.

10. Stars = *ipi-berre*, Mangarei; *bering*, *birrong*, Sydney.

11. Hand = *tanaraga*, Mangarei; *taintu*, Timbora; *tamira*, Sy ney.

12. Head = *jahé*, Mangarei; *chow*, King George's Sound.

13. Stars = *kingkong*, Timboro; *chindy*, King George's Sound, Australia.

14. Moon = *mang'ong*, Timbora; *meuc*, King George's Sound.

15. Sun = *ingkong*, Timbora; *coing*, Sydney.

16. Blood = *kero*, Timbora; *gnoorong*, Cowagary dialect of Australia.

17. Head = *kokore*, Timbora; *gogorrah*, Cowagary.

18. Fish = *appi*, Mangarei; *wapi*, Darnley Island.

Now as the three dialects have all undoubted Malay affi-

nities, the statement of Marsden must be received with qualifications.

V. Concerning the language of Van Diemen's Land, I venture upong the following statements, the proofs which I hope, ere long, to exhibit *in extenso*.

α. The Language is fundamentally the same for the whole island; although spoken in not less than four dialects mutually unintelligible.

β. It has affinities with the Australian.

γ. It has affinities with the New Caledonian.

A fourth proposition concerning the Tasmanian language exhibits an impression, rather than a deliberate opinion. Should it, however, be confirmed by future researches it will at once explain the points of physical contrast between the Tasmanian tribes and those of Australia that have so often been insisted on. It is this — that the affinities of language between the Tasmanian and the New Caledonian are stronger than those between the Australian and Tasmanian. This indicates that the stream of population for Van Diemens ran *round* Australia rather than *across* it.

The following affinities occur between the vocabularies published in the present volume and the Malay and Monosyllabic dialects; and they are the result of a very partial collation.

1. Blood = *mam*, Darnley Island; *muhum*, South Jooroo dialect of Malacca; *mau*, Anamitic of Cochin China.

2. Nose = *peet*, Darnley Island; *peechi*, Massied; *pih*, Chinese; *pi*, Kong Chinese.

3. Face = *awop aup;* Murray Islands; *eebu* = (head) Cape York, Massied; *oopoo* = (head) Tahiti; *epoo*, Sandwich Islands; *aopo*, Easter Island.

4. Hair = *moos*, Darnley Island; *mooche*, Massied; *maow*, Chinese.

5. Country = *gaed*, Darnley Island; *kaha*, Ternati.

6. Black = *gooli*, Darnley Island; *houli*, Tongataboo.

7. Hand = *tag*, Darnley Islane; *tangh*, Madagascar; *tong*, Jooro; *tay*, Anamitic. A current Malay root.

8. Fish = *wapi*, Darnley Island; *iba*, Poggy Isles off Sumatra. Also in other Malay dialects.

9. Flame, fire = *bae*, Darnley Island; *api*, Flores, or Ende; *fai*, Siamese; *ffoo*, Kong Chinese.

10. Hair = *yal*, Massied; *eeal*, Cape York; *yal*, Port Lihou; *houlou*, Tongataboo.

11. Teeth = *dang*, Massied; *danga*, Cape York; *dang*, Port Lihou; *dang'eta*, Gunong-talu of Celebes; *wahang*, Menadu; *rang*, Anamitic.

The evidence upon which I rest my belief of the fundamental unity of the three philological groups of the Malay, Papua, and Australian languages, is, of the sort called *cumulative;* and it is the only evidence that our present *data* will afford us.

Believing, however, in such a fundamental unity, the problem to be solved by further researches on the vocabularies from either Torres Strait or the South of New Guinea, is the problem as to the particular quarter from which New Holland was peopled — whether from New Guinea, or from Timor. Such a problem is not beyond the reach of *future* philologists.

In the fifth volume of Dr. Prichard's valuable work, I find that Mr. Norris has indicated points of likeness between the Australian dialects, and the Tamul languages of Southern India.

Such may be the case. If, however, the statements of those philologists who connect on one side the Tamul, and on the other the Malay, with the Monosyllabic languages, be correct, the two affinities are compatible.

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA (1859).

The error of presuming the ruder tribes to be Negrito is apparent in the notice of the Sumatra, and Borneo tribes. They should have no place in a list of Negritos at all.

The gist of the paper lies in the suggestions to break down (1) the lines of demarcation between the Australians, Tasmanians, and Papuans on one side, and the Malays &c. on the other, and (2) those between the Malay and Monosyllabic tongues.

REMARKS ON THE VOCABULARIES

OF THE

VOYAGE OF THE RATTLESNAKE.

APPENDIX TO MACGILLIVRAY'S VOYAGE OF THE HMS RATTLESNAKE. 1852.

In the way of comparative philology the most important part of the Grammar of the Australian languages is, generally, the Pronoun. That of the Kowrarega language will, therefore, be the first point investigated.

In the tongues of the Indo-European class the personal pronouns are pre-eminently constant, *i. e.*, they agree in languages which, in many other points, differ. How thoroughly the sound of *m* runs through the Gothic, Slavonic, and Iranian tongues as the sign of the pronoun of the first person singular, in the oblique cases; how regularly a modification of *t*, *s*, or *th*, appears in such words as *tu*, συ, *thou*, &c.! Now this *constancy* of the Pronoun exists in most languages; but not in an equally palpable and manifest form. It is disguised in several ways. Sometimes, as in the Indo-European tongues, there is one root for the nominative and one for the oblique cases; sometimes the same form, as in the Finlandic, runs through the whole declension; sometimes, as when we say *you* for *thou* in English, one *number* is substituted for another; and sometimes, as when the German says *sie* for *thou*, a change of the person is made as well. When languages are known in detail, these complications can be guarded against; but where the tongue is but imperfectly exhibited a special analysis becomes requisite.

Generally, the first person is more constant than the second, and the second than the third; indeed, the third is frequently no true personal pronoun at all, but a demonstrative employed to express the person or thing spoken of as the agent or object to a verb. Now, as there are frequently more demonstratives than one which can be used

in a personal sense, two languages may be, in reality, very closely allied, though their personal pronouns of the third person differ. Thus the Latin *ego* = εγω; but the Latin *hic* and *ille* by no means correspond in form with ὁς, αὐτος, and ἐκεινος. This must prepare us for not expecting a greater amount of resemblance between the Australian personal pronouns than really exists.

Beginning with the most inconstant of the three pronouns, viz., that of the third person, we find in the Kowrarega the following forms: —

3.

Singular, masculine	*nu-du* = *he*, *him*.
— feminine	*na-du* = *she*, *her*.
Dual, common	*pale* = *they two*, *them two*.
Plural, —	*tana* = *they*, *them*.

In the two first of these forms the *du* is no part of the root, but an affix, since the Gudang gives us the simpler forms *nue* and *na*. *Pale*, the dual form, occurs in the Western Australian, the New South Wales, the South Australian, and the Parnkalla as follows: *boola*, *bulo-ara*, *purl-a*, *pud-lanbi* = *they two*.

2.

Singular	*ngi-du* = *thou*, *thee*.
Dual	*ngi-pel* = *ye two*, *you two*.
Plural	*ngi-tana* = *ye*, *you*.

Here the root is limited to the syllable *ngi*, as shewn not less by the forms *ngi-pel*, and *ngi-tana*, than by the simple Gudang *ngi* = *thou*.

Ngi, expressive of the second person, is common in Australia: *ngi-nnee*, *ngi-ntoa*, *ni-nna*, *ngi-nte* = *thou*, *thee*, in the W. Australian, N. S. Wales, Parnkalla, and Encounter Bay dialects.

Ngi-pel is probably *thou* + *pair*. *A priori* this is a likely way of forming a dual. As to the reasons *a posteriori* they are not to be drawn wholly from the Kowrarega tongue itself. Here the word for two is not *pel* but *quassur*. But let us look further. The root *p-l*, or a modification of it, = *two* in the following dialects; as well as in the Parnkalla and others — *pur-laityе*, *poolette*, *par-kooloo*, *bull-a*, in the Adelaide, Boraipar, Yak-kumban, and Murrumbidge. That it may stand too for the dual personal pronoun is shewn in the first of these tongues; since in the Adelaide language

purla = *ye two*. Finally, its appearance amongst the pronouns, and its absence amongst the numerals, occurs in the Western Australian. The numeral *two* is *kardura;* but the dual pronoun is *boala*. The same phenomenon would occur in the present English if two circumstances had taken place, viz., if the Anglo-Saxon dual *wi-t* = *we two* had been retained up to the present time amongst the pronouns, and the word *pair*, *brace*, or *couple*, had superseded *two* amongst the numerals.

Lastly, the Western Australian and the Kowrarega so closely agree in the use of the numeral *two* for the dual pronoun, that each applies it in the same manner. In the *third* person it stands alone, so that in W. Australian *boala*, and in Kowrarega *pale* = *they two*, just as if in English we said *pair* or *both*, instead of *they both* (*he pair*); whilst in the second person, the pronoun precedes it, and a compound is formed; just as if in English we translated the Greek σφῶι by *thou pair* or *thou both*.

1.

Singular	*nga-tu* = *I*, *me*.
Dual	*albei* = *we two*, *us two*.
Plural	*arri* = *we*, *us*.

Here the plural and dual are represented, not by a modification of the singular, but by a new word; as different from *nga* as *nos* is from *ego*. The *tu*, of course, is non-radical, the Gudang form being *ngai*.

Nga, expressive of the first person, is as common as *ngi*, equivalent to the second. Thus, nga-*nya*, nga-*toa*, nga-*i*, nga-*pe* = *I*, *me*, in the W. Australian, N. S. Wales, Parnkalla, and Encounter Bay dialects.

Now, the difference between the first and second persons being expressed by different modifications (*nga*, *ngi*,) of the same root (*ng*), rather than by separate words, suggests the inquiry as to the original power of that root. It has already been said that, in many languages, the pronoun of the *third* person is, in origin, a demonstrative. In the Kowrarega it seems as if even the basis of the first and second was the root of the demonstrative also; since, by looking lower down in the list, we find that *i-na* = *this*, *che-na* = *that*, and *nga-du* (*nga* in Gudang) = *who*. *Ina* and *chena* also means *here* and *there*, respectively.

The dual form *albei* reappears in the Yak-kumban dialect of the River Darling where *allewa* = *we two*. *Arri* = *us*, is also the first syllable in the Western Australian form *ar-*

lingul = *we;* or, rather it is *ar-lingul* in a simpler and less compounded form. In a short specimen of Mr. Eyre's from the head of the Great Australian Bight, the form in *a* appears in the singular number, *ajjo* = *I* and *me*. The root *tana* = *they*, is not illustrated without going as far as the Western Australian of Mr. Eyre. Here, however, we find it in the compound word *par-tanna* = *many*. Its original power is probably *others*; and it is most likely a widely diffused Australian root.

The pronouns in question are compound rather than simple; *i. e.* instead of *nga* = *me*, and *ngi* = *thee*, we have *nga-tu* and *ngi-du*. What is the import and explanation of this? It may safely be said, that the termination in the Australian is *not* a termination like the Latin *met* in *ego-met*, inasmuch as this last is constant throughout the three persons (*ego-met*, *tute-met*, *se-met*), whereas, the former varies with the pronoun to which it is appended (*nga-tu*, and *ngi-du*). I hazard the conjecture that the two forms correspond with the adverbs *here* and *there*; so that *nga-tu* = *I here*, and *ngi-du* = *thou* there, and *nu-du* = he there. In respect to the juxta-position of the *simple* forms (*ngai*, *ngi*, and *nue*) of the Gudang with the compound ones (*nga-tu*, *ngi-du*, and *nu-du*) of the Kowrarega, it can be shewn that the same occurs in the Parnkalla of Port Lincoln; where Mr. Eyre gives the double form *ngai* and *nga-ppo* each = *I* or *me*.

Now, this analysis of the Kowrarega personals has exhibited the evolution of one sort of pronoun out of another, with the addition of certain words expressive of number, the result being no true inflexion but an agglutination or combination of separate words. It has also shewn how the separate elements of such combinations may appear in different forms and with different powers in different dialects of the same language, and different languages of the same class, even where, in the primary and normal signification, they may be wanting in others. The first of these facts is a contribution to the laws of language in general; the second shews that a great amount of apparent difference may be exhibited on the surface of a language which disappears as the analysis proceeds.

In rude languages the Numerals vary with the dialect more than most other words. We can understand this by imagining what the case would be in English if one of our dialects counted things by the *brace*, another by the *pair*, and a third by the *couple*. Nevertheless, if we bear in mind the Greek forms θαλασσα and θαλαττα, we may fairly suppose that the Kowrarega word for *two*, or *quassur*, is the same

word with the Head of Australian Bight *kootera*, the Parnkalla *kuttara*, and the W. Australian *kardura*, having the same meaning.

The difference, then, between the *numerals* of the Australian languages — and it is undoubtedly great — is no proof of any fundamental difference of structure or origin. It is just what occurs in the languages of Africa, and, in a still greater degree, in those of America.

The *extent to which the numeration is carried* is a matter of more importance. Possibly a numeration limited to the first three, four, or five numbers is the *effect of* intellectual inferiority. It is certainly a cause that continues it. As a measure of ethnological affinity it is unimportant. In America we have, within a limited range of languages, vigesimal systems like the Mexican, and systems limited to the three first units like the Caribb. The difference between a vigesimal and decimal system arises simply from the practice of counting by the fingers and toes collectively, or the fingers alone, being prevalent; whereas the decimal system as opposed to the quinary is referrible to the numeration being extended to both hands, instead of limited to one. Numerations not extending as far as *five* are generally independent of the fingers *in toto*. Then as to the names of particular numbers. Two nations may each take the name of the number *two* from some natural dualism; but they may not take it from the same. For instance, one American Indian may take it from a pair of *skates*, another from a pair of *shoes*. If so, the word for *two* will differ in the two languages, even when the names for *skate* and *shoe* agree. All this is supported by real facts, and is no hypothetical illustration; so that the inference from it is, that, in languages where a *numeral system* is in the process of formation, difference in the names of the numbers is comparatively unimportant.

The extent to which the numerals vary, the extent to which they agree, and the extent to which this variation and agreement are anything but coincident with geographical proximity or distance, may be seen in the following table: —

English	one	two	three
Moreton Bay	kamarah	bulla	mudyan
— Island	karawo	poonlah	madan
Bijenelumbo	warat	ngargark	2 + 1
Limbakarajia	erat	ngargark	do.
Terrutong	roka	oryalk	do.

Limbapyu	immuta	lawidperra	2 + 1
Kowrarega	warapune	quassur	do.
Gudang	epiamana	elabaio	do.
Darnley Island	netat	nes	do.
Raffles Bay	loca	orica	orongarie
Lake Macquarie	wakol	buloara	ngoro
Peel River	peer	pular	purla
Wellington	ngungbai	bula	bula-ngungbai
Corio	koimoil	——	——
Jhongworong	kap	——	——
Pinegorine	youa	——	——
Gnurellean	lua	——	——
King George's Sound	keyen	cuetrel	murben
Karaula	mal	bular	culeba
Lachlan, Regent Lake	nyoonbi	bulia	bulongonbi
Wollondilly River	medung	pulla	colluerr

The Verb now requires notice. In languages in the same stage of development with the Australian the usual analysis, as shewn by the late Mr. Garnett in his masterly papers on the structure of the verb, is as follows: 1. The root. 2. The *possessive* pronoun. 3. A particle of *time* — often originally one of *place*.

A rough illustration of this is the statement that such a word as *dormivi* = *sleep* — *my* — *then* (or *there*). To apply this doctrine to the Kowrarega with our present *data*, is unsafe. Still, I am inclined (notwithstanding some difficulties) to identify the *pa* of the Present tense with the *bu* in *kai-bu* = *now*, and the *n* of the preterite with the *n* of *che-na* = *there*.

The double forms of the Past tense (one in *n*, and another in *m*) are at present inexplicable. So are the double forms of the Imperative, viz. the one in *r*, and the one in *e*. It may, however, be remarked, that wherever the Imperative ends in *e*, the Preterite has the form in *m;* thus, *pid-e* = *dig*, *pid-ema* = *dug*. The only exception is the anomalous form *peneingodgi* = *dived*. This prepares the future grammarian for a division of the Kowrarega Verbs into Conjugations.

The last class of words that supply the materials of comment are the Substantives. Herein, the formation of the plural by the addition of *le*, probably occurs in several of the Australian tongues. I infer this from many of those words which we find in the vocabularies of languages whereof the grammar is unknown, and which are expressive of naturally *plural* objects ending in *li*, *la*, or *l*.

1. Star (stars) — *pur-le*, *pi-lle*, *poo-lle*, in Parnkalla, Aiawong, and Yak-kumban.

2. Fire (flames) — *ka-lla*, *gad-la*, in W. Australian and Parnkalla.

3. Head (hair) — *kur-le*, Encounter Bay. Here we learn from the forms *kar-ga*, from the Head of the Great Australian Bight, and *ma-kar-ta*, from Adelaide, that the *l* is foreign to the root.

4. Hands — *marrow-la* in the Molonglo dialect; and contrasted with *marra* in the Adelaide.

This, however, is merely a conjecture; a conjecture, however, which has a practical bearing. It suggests caution in the comparison *of* vocabularies; since, by mistaking an inflexion or an affix for a part of the root, we may overlook really existing similarities.

Father Anjello's very brief grammatical sketch of the Limbakarajia language of Port Essington * exhibits, as far as it goes, precisely the same *principles* as Mr. Macgillivray's Kowrarega; indeed, some of the details coincide.

Thus, the Limbakarajia personal pronouns are —

I = *nga-pi.*	*We* = *ngari.*
Thou = *noie.*	*We two* = *arguri.*
He, *she*, *it* = *gianat.*	*Ye* = *noie.*

They = *ngalmo.*

Here the *pi* in *nga-pi* is the *po* in the Aiawong *nga-ppo;* the *gian* in *gian-at* being, probably, the *in* in the Kowrarega *ina* = *that, this. Ngalmo*, also, is expressly stated to mean *many* as well as *they*, a fact which confirms the view taken of *tana.*

As for the tenses of the verbs, they are evidently no true tenses at all, but merely combinations of the verbal root, and an adverb of time. In Limbakarajia, however, the adverbial element *precedes* the verbal one. In Kowrarega, however, the equivalent to this adverbial element (probably a simple adverb modified in form so as to amalgamate with its verb, and take the appearance of an inflexion) follows it — a difference of order, sequence, or position, upon which some philologists will, perhaps, lay considerable stress. On the contrary, however, languages exceedingly similar in other respects, may differ in the order of the parts of a term; *e. g.* the German dialects, throughout, place the article *before* the noun, and keep it separate: whereas the

---

Given to Mr. Macgillivray by Mr. James Macarthur, and prefixed to the MS. Port Essington Vocabulary, alluded to at p. 157 of Vol. I.

Scandinavian tongues not only make it follow, but incorporate it with the substantive with which it agrees. Hence, a term which, if modelled on the German fashion, should be *hin sol*, becomes, in Scandinavian, *solen = the sun*. And this is but one instance out of many. Finally, I may add that the prefix *apa*, in the present tense of the verb = *cut*, is, *perhaps*, the same affix *eipa* in the present tense of the Kowrarega verbs.

Another point connected with the comparative philology of Australia is the peculiarity of its phonetic system. The sounds of *f* and *s* are frequently wanting. Hence, the presence of either of them in one dialect has been considered as evidence of a wide ethnological difference. Upon this point — in the case of *s* — the remarks on the sound systems of the Kowrarega and Gudang are important. The statement is, the *s* of the one dialect becomes *ty* or *tsh* (and *ch*) in the other. Thus the English word *breast = susu*, Kowrarega; *tyu-tyu*, Gudang, and the English *outrigger float = sarima*, Kowrarega; *charima*, Gudang, — which of these two forms is the older? Probably the Gudang, or the form in *ty*. If so, the series of changes is remarkable, and by attending to it we may see how sounds previously non-existent may become evolved.

Thus — let the original form for *breast* be *tutu*. The first change which takes place is the insertion of the sound of *y*, making *tyu-tyu;* upon the same principle which makes certain Englishmen say *gyarden*, *kyind*, and *skyey*, for *garden*, *kind*, and *sky*. The next change is for *ty* to become *tsh*. This we find also in English, where *picture* or *pictyoor* is pronounced *pictshur*, &c. This being the change exhibited in the Gudang form *tyutyu* (pr. *choochoo*, or nearly so), we have a remarkable phonetic phenomenon, viz. the existence of a compound sound (*tsh*) wherein *s* is an element, in a language where *s*, otherwise than as the element of a compound, is wanting. In other words, we have a *sound formed out of s*, but not *s* itself; or (changing the expression still further) we have *s* in certain combinations, but not uncombined. Let, however, the change proceed, and the initial sound of *t* be lost. In this case *tsh* becomes *sh*. A further change reduces *sh* to *s*.

When all this has taken place — and there are many languages wherein the whole process is exhibited — the sound of a hitherto unknown articulation becomes *evolved* or *developed* by a natural process of growth, and that in a language where it was previously wanting. The phenomenon, then, of the evolution of new simple sounds should caution us against over-valuing phonetic differences. So should such

facts as that of the closely allied dialects of the Gudang and Kowrarega differing from each other by the absence or presence of so important a sound as that of *s*.

The comparative absence, however, of the sound of *s*, in Australian, may be further refined on in another way; and it may be urged that it is absent, not because it has never been developed, or called into existence, but because it has ceased to exist. In the Latin of the Augustan age as compared with that of the early Republic, we find the *s* of words like *arbos* changed into *r* (*arbor*). The old High German, also, and the Icelandic, as compared with the Meso-Gothic, does the same. Still the change only affects certain inflectional syllables, so that the original *s* being only partially displaced, retains its place in the language, although it occurs in fewer words. In Australian, where it is wanting at all, it is wanting *in toto:* and this is a reason for believing that its absence is referrible to non-development rather than to displacement. For reasons too lengthy too exhibit, I believe that this latter view is *not* applicable to Australian; the *s*, when wanting, being undeveloped. In either case, however, the phonetic differences between particular dialects are the measures of but slight differences.

Now — with these preliminary cautions against the overvaluation of apparent differences — we may compare the new *data* for the structure of the Kowrarega and Limbakarajia with the received opinions respecting the Australian grammars in general.

These refer them to the class of *agglutinate* tongues, *i. e.* tongues wherein the inflections can be shewn to consist of separate words more or less incorporated or amalgamated with the roots which they modify. It may be said that this view is confirmed rather than impugned.

Now, what applies to the Australian grammars applies also to Polynesian and the more highly-developed Malay languages, — such as the Tagala of the Philippines, for instance; and, if such being the case, no difference of *principle in respect to their structure* separates the Australian from the languages of those two great classes. But the details, it may be said, differ undoubtedly; and this is what we expect. Plural numbers, signs of tense, and other grammatical elements, are evolved by means of the juxtaposition of *similar* but not *identical* elements, *e. g.* one plural may be formed by the affix signifying *many;* another, by the affix signifying *with* or *conjointly;* one preterite may be the root *plus* a word meaning *then;* another the root *plus* a word meaning *there*. Futures, too, may be equally evolved by the

incorporation or juxtaposition of the word meaning *after*, or the word meaning *to-morrow*. All this makes the exact coincidence of the details of inflection the exception rather than the rule.

This doctrine goes farther than the mere breaking-down of the lines of demarcation which separate classes of languages like the Australian from classes of languages like the Malayo-Polynesian. It shews how both may be evolved from monosyllabic tongues like the Chinese or Siamese. The proof that such is really the case lies in the similarity of individual words, and consists in comparative tables. It is too lengthy for the present paper, the chief object of which is to bring down the inferences from the undoubtedly great superficial differences between the languages of the parts in question to their proper level.

In respect to the *vocabularies*, the extent to which the analysis which applies to the grammar applies to the vocables also may be seen in the following instance. The word *hand* Bijenelumbo and Limbapyu is *birgalk*. There is also in each language a second form — *anbirgalk* — wherein the *an* is *non-radical*. So, also, is the *alk;* since we find that *armpit* = *ingamb-alk*, *shoulder* = *mundy-alk*, and *fingers* = *mong alk*. This brings the root = *hand* to *birg*. Now this we can find elsewhere by looking for. In the Liverpool dialect, *bir-il* = *hand*, and at King George's Sound, *peer* = *nails*. The commonest root, = *hand* in the Australian dialects, is *m-r*, *e. g.*

Moreton Bay	*murrah*	Corio	*far-onggnetok*
Karaula	*marra*	Jhongworong	*far-okgnata*
Sydney	*da-mora*	Murrumbidje	*mur-rugan*
Mudje	*mara*	Molonglo	*mar-rowla*
Wellington	*murra*	Head of Bight	*merrer*
Liverpool	*ta-mura*	Parnkalla	*marra*

All this differs from the Port Essington terms. *Elbow*, however, in the dialects there spoken, = *waare;* and *forearm* = *am-ma-woor; wier*, too, = *palm* in Kowrarega.

To complete the evidence for this latter word being the same as the *m-r* of the other dialects and languages, it would be necessary to shew, by examples, how the sounds of *m* and *w* interchange; and also to shew (by examples, also) how the ideas of *elbow, forearm*, and *hand* do so. But as the present remarks are made for the sake of illustrating a method, rather than establishing any particular point, this is not necessary here; a few instances taken from the names of the parts of the human body being sufficient to shew the general distribution of some of the commoner Australian roots,

and the more special fact of their existence in the northern dialects:

English	*hand*	Peel River	*ma*
Terrutong	*manawiye*	Raffles Bay	*maneiya*

English	*foot*	Moreton Bay	*chidna*
Moreton Island	*tenang*	Karaula	*tinna*
Peel River	*tina*	Lake Mac-quarie	*tina*
Mudje	*dina*	Jhongworong	*gnen-ong-gnat-a*
Wellington	*dinnung*	Corio	*gen-ong-gnet-ok*
Liverpool	*dana*	Colack	*ken-ong-gnet-ok*
Bathurst	*dina*	Bight Head	*jinna*
Boraipar	*tchin-nang-y*	Parnkalla	*idna*
Lake Hind-marsh	*jin-nerr*	Aiawong	*dtun*
Murrumbidje	*tjin-nuk*	K. George's Sound	*tian*
Molonglo	*tjin-y-gy*	Goold Island	*pinyun* and *pinkan*
Pinegorine	*gena*		
Gnurellean	*gen-ong-be-gnen-a*		

English	*hair, beard*	Goold Island	*kiaram*
Moreton Island	*yerreng*	Wellington	*uran*
Bijenelumbo	*yirka*	Karaula	*yerry*
Regent's Lake	*ooran*	Sydney	*yaren*
Lake Mac-quarie	*wurung*	Peel River	*ierai*
		Mudge	*yarai*

English	*eye*	Jhongworong	*mer-ing-gna-ta*
Moreton Island	*mel*	Pinegorine	*ma*
Moreton Bay	*mill*	Gnurellean	*mer-e-gnen-a*
Gudang	*emeri* = *eye-brow*	Boraipar	*mer-ring-y*
		Lake Hind-marsh	*mer*
Bijenelumbo	*merde* = *eyelid*		
Regent's Lake	*mil*	Lake Mundy	*meer-rang*
Karaula	*mil*	Murrumbidje	*mit*
Mudje	*mir*	Bight Head	*mail*
Corio	*mer-gnet-ok*	K. George's Sound	*mial*
Colack	*mer-gnen-ok*		
Dautgart	*mer-gna-nen*		

English	*tooth*	Sydney	*yera*
Moreton Island	*tiya*	Wellington	*irang*
Moreton Bay	*deer*	Murrumbidje	*yeeran*
Lake Macquarie	*tina*	Goold Island	*eera*

English	*tongue*	Lake Macquarie	*talan*
Moreton Bay	*dalan*	Sydney	*dalan*
Regent's Lake	*talleng*	Peel River	*tale*
Karaula	*talley*	K. George's Sound	*talien*
Goold Island	*talit*		

English	*ear*	Moreton Bay	*bidna*
Kowrarega	*kowra*	Karaula	*binna*
Sydney	*kure*	Peel River	*bine*
Liverpool	*kure*	Bathurst	*benang-arei*
Lake Macquarie	*ngureong*	Goold Island	*pinna*

The Miriam Vocabulary belongs to a different class, viz. the Papuan. It is a dialect of language first made known to us through the Voyage of the Fly, as spoken in the islands Erroob, Maer, and Massied. Admitting this, we collate it with the North Australian tongues, and that, for the sake of *contrast* rather than *comparison*. Here, the philologist, from the extent to which the Australian tongues differ from each other, notwithstanding their real affinity, is prepared to find greater differences between an *Australian* and a *Papuan* language than, at the first glance, exists. Let us verify this by reference to some words which relate to the human body, and its parts.

English.	Erroob.	Massied.	Kowrarega.	gudang.
Nose	*pit*	*pichi*	*piti*	——
Lips	——	*anka*	——	*angka*
Cheek	*baag*	——	*baga*	*baga*
Chin, jaw	*iba*	*ibu*	*ibu*	*ebu*
Navel	*kopor, kupor*	*kupor*	*kupar*	*kopurra*
Eye	——	*dana*	*dana*	*dana*
Skin	*egur*	——	——	*equora*
Vein	*kerer*	*kirer*	*kerur*	*kerur*
Bone	*lid*	——	*rida*	——
Sore	*bada*	——	*bada*	——

Few Australian vocabularies are thus similar — a fact which may be said to prove too much; since it may lead to inference that the so-called Papuan tongue of Torres Strait is really Australian. Nevertheless, although I do not absolutely deny that such is the case, the evidence of the whole body of ethnological facts — *e. g.* those connected with the moral, intellectual, and physical conformation of the two populations — is against it.

And so is the philology itself, if we go further. The Erroob pronouns are,

Me = ka	*you = ma*	*his = eta*
Mine = ka ra	*your = ma ra*	

all of which are un-Australian.

Are we then to say that all the words of the table just given are borrowed from the Australian by the Papuans, or *vice versâ?* No. Some belong to the common source of the two tongues, *pit = nose* being, probably, such a word; whilst others are the result of subsequent intercourse.

Still, it cannot absolutely be said that the Erroob or Miriam tongue is not Australian also, or *vice versâ*. Still less, is it absolutely certain that the former is not transitional between the New Guinea language and the Australian. I believe, however, that it is not so.

The doubts as to the philological position of the Miriam are by no means diminished by reference to the nearest unequivocally Papuan vocabulary, viz. that of Redscar Bay. Here the difference exceeds rather than falls short of our expectations. The most important of the few words which coincide are

English.	Redscar Bay.	Erroob.
Head	*quara*	*herem*
Mouth	*mao*	*mit = lips*
Testicles	*abu*	*eba = penis*
Shoulder	*paga*	*pagas = upper arm*

On the other hand, the Redscar Bay word for *throat, kato*, coincides with the Australian *karta* of the Gudang of Cape York. Again, a complication is introduced by the word *buni-mata = eyebrow*. Here *mata* = eye, and, consequently, *buni* = brow. This root re-appears in the Erroob; but there it means the *eyeball*, as shewn by the following words from Jukes' Vocabulary.

Eye	*irkeep*
Eyebrow	*irkeep moos = eye-hair*

Eye ball	*poni*
Eyelid	*poni-pow* = *eyeball-hair*

Probably the truer meaning of the Redscar Bay word is *eyeball*.

No inference is safer than that which brings the population of the Louisiade Archipelago, so far, at least, as it is represented by the Vocabularies of Brierly Island and Duchateau Island, from the eastern coast of New Guinea. What points beyond were peopled from Louisiade is another question.

For the islands between New Ireland and New Caledonia our *data* are lamentably scanty; the list consisting of —

1. A short vocabulary from the Solomon Isles.
2. Short ones from Mallicollo.
3. The same from Tanna.
4. Shorter ones still from Erromanga and
5. Annatom.
6. Cook's New Caledonian Vocabulary.
7. La Billardiere's ditto.

The collation of these with the Louisiade has led me to a fact which I little expected. As far as the very scanty *data* go, they supply the closest resemblance to the Louisiade dialects, from the two New Caledonian vocabularies. Now New Caledonia was noticed in the Appendix to the Voyage of the Fly (vol. ii. p. 318) as *apparently* having closer philological affinities with *Van Diemen's Land*, than that country had with Australia; an apparent fact which induced me to write as follows: "A proposition concerning the Tasmanian language exhibits an impression, rather than a deliberate opinion. Should it, however, be confirmed by future researches, it will at once explain the points of physical contrast between the Tasmanian tribes and those of Australia that have so often been insisted on. It is this — that the affinities of language between the Tasmanian and the New Caledonian are stronger than those between the Australian and Tasmanian. This indicates that the stream of population for Van Diemen's Land ran *round* Australia, rather than across it." Be this as it may, the remark, with our present scanty materials, is, at best, but a suggestion — a suggestion, however, which would account for the physical appearance of the Tasmanian being more New Caledonian than Australian.

The chief point of resemblance between the Louisiade and the New Caledonian is taken from the numerals. In each system there is a *prefix*, and in each that prefix begins

with a labral letter — indeed the *wa* of New Caledonia and the *pahi* of Louisiade seem to be the same roots.

	1.	2.
Brierly Island	paihe-tia	pahi-wo
Cook's New Caledonia	wa-geeaing	wa-roo
La Billardiere's do.	oua-nait	oua-dou
	3.	4.
Brierly Island	paihe-tuan	paihe-pak
Cook's New Caledonia	wa-teen	wa-mbaeek
La Billardiere's do.	oua-tguien	oua-tbait
	5.	6.
Brierly Island	paihe-lima	paihe-won
Cook's New Caledonia	wa-nnim	wa-nnim-geeek
La Billardiere's do.	oua-nnaim	ou-naim-guik
	7.	8.
Brierly Island	pahe-pik	paihe-wan
Cook's New Caledonia	wa-nnim-noo	wa-nnim-gain
La Billardiere's do.	oua-naim-dou	ou-naim-guein
	9.	10.
Brierly Island	paihe-siwo	paihe-awata
Cook's New Caledonia	wa-nnim-baeek	wa-nnoon-aiuk
La Billardiere's do.	oua-naim-bait	oua-doun-hic

The Redscar Bay numerals are equally instructive. They take two forms: one with, one without, the prefix in *ow*, as recorded by Mr. Macgillivray.

This system of prefix is not peculiar. The Tanna and Mallicollo numerals of Cook are —

English.	Tanna.	Mallicollo.
One	r-eedee	tsee-kaee
Two	ka-roo	e-ry
Three	ka-har	e-rei
Four	kai-phar	e-bats
Five	k-reerum	e-reeum
Six	ma-r-eedee	tsookaeee
Seven	ma-k-roo	gooy
Eight	ma-ka-har	hoo-rey
Nine	ma-kai-phar	good-bats
Ten	ma-k-reerum	senearu

Here, although the formations are not exactly regular, the prefixion of an initial syllable is evident. So is the quinary character of the numeration. The prefix itself, however, in the Tanna and Mallicollo is no *labial*, as in the Louisiade and New Caledonian, but either *k* or a vowel.

The next fact connected with the Louisiade vocabularies is one of greater interest. Most of the names of the different *parts of the body* end in *da*. In the list in question they were marked in italics; so that the proportion they bear to the words not so ending was easily seen. Now it is only the words belonging to this class that thus terminate. Elsewhere the ending *da* is no commoner than any other.

What does this mean? If we look to such words as *mata-da* = eyes, *sopa-da* = lips, *maka-da* = teeth, and some other naturally *plural* names, we should infer that it was a sign of *number*. That this, however, is not the case is shewn by the equivalents to *tongue*, *nose*, and other *single* members where the affix is equally common. What then is its import? The *American* tongues help us here.

English	Mbaya	Abiponi	Mokobi
Head	na-guilo	ne-maiat	——
Eye	ni-gecoge	na-toele	ni-cote
Ear	na-pagate	——	——
Nose	ni-onige	——	
Tongue	no-gueligi	——	——
Hair	na-modi	ne-etiguic	na-ecuta
Hand	ni-baagadi	na-pakeni	na-poguena
Foot	no-gonagi	——	——

English	Moxa (1)*	Moxa (2)	Moxa (3)
Head	nu-ciuti	nu-chuti	nu-chiuti
Eye	nu-chi	——	nu-ki
Ear	nu-cioca	——	——
Nose	nu-siri	nu-siri	——
Tongue	nu-nene	nu-nene	nu-nene
Hand	nu-bore	nu-boupe	nu-bore
Foot	ni-bope	——	ni-bope

Now in these, and in numerous other American tongues, the prefix is the *possessive pronoun;* in other words, there is a great number of American languages where the capacity for abstracting the thing possessed from the possessor is so slight as to make it almost impossible to disconnect the noun from its pronoun. I believe, then, the affixes in question

* These are three different dialects.

have a *possessive* power; and am not aware that *possessive* adjuncts thus incorporated have been recognised in any of the languages for these parts; indeed, they are generally considered as American characteristics.

How far does their presence extend? In the New Caledonian vocabulary of La Billardiere we find it. The names of the parts of the body all take an affix, which no other class of words does. This is *gha*, *guai*, or *ghai*, or other similar combination of *g* with a vowel. In Van Diemen's Land, an important locality, we find the following series of words, which are submitted to the judgment of the reader.

English.	Western Tasmanian.
Foot	lula
Leg	peea = piya = posteriors, Brumer I.
Thigh	tula = turi = knee, Brumer I.
Belly	cawara-ny
Neck	denia
Ears	lewli-na
Nose	me-na
Eyes	pollatoola = matara-pulupulura = eyelashes, Brierly I.
Hair	pareata
—	palani-na
Face	manrable
Mouth	ca-nia
Teeth	yannalople = yinge-da, Brierly I.
Tongue	tulla-na
Arm	alree
Fist	reannema-na
Head	pulbea-ny

Here the termination *na* appears elsewhere, as in *memana* = fight, *nabagee-na* = sun; but by no means so frequently, nor yet with such an approach to regularity.

English.	Circular Head.
Hair	parba
Hand	rabal-ga
Foot	rabuc-ka
Head	cwuc-ka
Eye	mameric-ca
Nose	rowari-ga
Tongue	mamana = mimena, Brumer I.
Teeth	cawna
Ear	cowanrig-ga

Here however, it must not be concealed that the termination ka, or ga, occurs in other words, such as tenal-ga

= laugh, tar-ga = cry, teiri-ga = walk, lamunika = see. These, however, are verbs; and it is possible (indeed probable) that the *k* or *g* is the same as in the preceding substantives, just as the *m* in *su-m* and *εἰ-μι* is the *m* in *meus*, *me*, and *ἐμι*. Still, this will not apply throughout; *e. g.* the words like lalli-ga = kangaroo, para-ka = flower, and others.

English.	Eastern Tasmanian.
Eye	lepe-na
Ear	pelverata
Elbow	rowella
Foot	langa-na
Fist	trew
Head	pathe-na-naddi
Hair	cetha-na
Hand	anama-na = nema-da, Brumer I.
Knee	nannabena-na
Leg	lathana-ma
Teeth	yan-na = yinge-da, Brierly I.
Tongue	me-na = mime-na, Brumer I.
Chin	came-na
Neck	lepera
Breast	wagley

Here, the number of other words ending in *na* is very considerable; so considerable that, if it were not for the cumulative evidence derived from other quarters, it would be doubtful whether the *na* could legitimately be considered as a possessive affix at all. It may, however, be so even in the present instance.

To these we may add two lists from the Lobo and Utanata dialects of the south-western coast of New Guinea.

English	Utanata	Lobo
Arms	too	nima-ngo
Back	urimi	rusuko-ngo
Beard	.....	minooro
Belly	imauw	kamboro-ngo
Breast-female	auw	gingo-ngo
Breast-male	paiety	
Cheeks	awamu	wafiwirio-ngo
Ears	ianie	.....
Eyebrows	.....	matata-ngo-waru
Eyes	mame	matatoto-ngo
Fingers	.....	nima-nga-sori
Foot	mouw	kai-ngo
Hands	toe-mare	nima-ngo-uta

Hair	oeirie	mono-ng-furu
Head	oepauw	mono-ngo or umum
Knee	iripu	kai-ngo-woko
Mouth	irie	orie-ngo
Nose	birimboe	sikaio-ngo
Neck	ema	gara-ng
Tongue	mare	kario-ngo
Thigh	ai	willanima
Teeth	titi	riwoto-ngo
Toes	.....	nisora

Finally, we have the long, and evidently compound forms of the Corio, Colack, and other Australian dialects; long and evidently compound forms which no hypothesis so readily explains as that of the possessive adjunct; a phenomenon which future investigation may shew to be equally Oceanic and American.

NOTES AND ADDENDA.

The vocabularies of the Rattlesnake are (1) Australian, (2) Papuan.

The former were for the parts about Cape York, *i. e.* the Northermost part of Australia, and also the part nearest the Papuan area. The Kowrarega was the form of speech best illustrated.

The Papuan vocabularies were for the Louisiade Archipelago; wholly new as *data* for a very important and interesting area.

The following paper, connected with the remarks on the incorporation of the possessive pronoun with certain substantives, though on an Asiatic language may find place here.

ON A ZAZA VOCABULARY.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

MAY THE 23RD.

The following vocabulary is one taken by Dr. H. Sandwith from a Kurd of the Zaza tribe, one of the rudest of the whole Kurd family, and one for which we have no philological specimens.

English.	Zaza.	English.	Zaza.
head	sèrè-*min.*	*sea*	aho.
eyes	tchim-e*min.*	*valley*	derèi.
eyebrows	buruè-*min.*	*eggs*	hoiki.
nose	zinjè-*min.*	*a fowl*	kerghi.
moustache	simile-*min.*	*welcome*	tebèxairomè.
beard	ardishè-*min.*	*come*	bèiri.
tongue	zoanè-*min.*	*stay*	rōshè.
teeth	dildouè-*min.*	*bread*	noan.
ears	gushè-*min.*	*water*	āwè.
fingers	ingishtè-*min.*	*child*	katchimo.
arm	paziè-*min.*	*virgin*	keinima.
legs	hingè-*min.*	*orphan*	lajekima.
father	pie-*min.*	*morning*	shaurow.
mother	mai-*min.*	*tree*	dori.
sister	wai-*min.*	*iron*	asin.
brother	brai *min.*	*hare*	aurish.
the back	pashtiai-*min.*	*greyhound*	taji.
hair	porè-*min.*	*pig*	khooz.
cold	serdo.	*earth*	ert.
hot	auroghermo.	*fire*	adir.
sun	rojshwesho.	*stone*	see.
moon	hashmè.	*silver*	sém.
star	sterrai.	*strength*	kote.
mountain	khoo.	*sword*	shimshir.

English.	Zaza.	English.	Zaza.
a fox	krèvesh.	*a house*	kè.
stag	kivè.	*green*	kesk.
partridge	zaraj.	*crimson*	soor.
milk	shut.	*black*	siah.
horse	istor.	*white*	supèo.
mare	mahinè.	*sleep*	rausume.
grapes	eshkijshi.	*go*	shoori

The meaning of the termination *-min* has been explained by Pott and Rödiger in their *Kurdische Studien*. It is the possessive pronoun of the first person = *my* = *meus* = ἐμός, &c.; so that sèrè-*min* = caput-*meum* (or *mei*), and pie-*min* = pater-*meus* (or *mei*).

So little was the Zaza who supplied Dr. Sandwith with the list under notice able to conceive a *hand* or *father*, except so far as they were related to himself, or something else, and so essentially concrete rather than abstract were his notions, that he combined the pronoun with the substantive whenever he had a *part of the human body* or a *degree of consanguinity* to name. It is difficult to say how far this amalgamation is natural to the uncultivated understanding, *i. e.* it is difficult to say so on *à priori* grounds. That the condition of a person applied to for the purpose of making a glossary out of his communications is different from that under which we maintain our ordinary conversation, is evident. Ordinary conversation gives us a certain number of words, and a context as well. A glossary gives us words only, and disappoints the speaker who is familiar with contexts.

If this be true, imperfect contexts, like the combinations *pie-min*, &c. should be no uncommon occurrences. Nor are they so. They are pre-eminently common in the American languages. Thus in Mr. Wallace's vocabularies from River Uapes the list run thus: —

English.	Uainambeu.	Juri.	barrè.
head (my)	*eri*-bida	*tcho*-kereu	*no*-dusia
mouth (my)	*eri*-numa	*tcho*-ia	*no*-nunia.
&c.	&c.	&c.	&c.

similar illustrations being found in almost every American glossary.

In his Appendix to Macgillivray's Voyage of the Rattlesnake, the present writer has pointed out instances of this amalgamation in the languages of the Louisiade. He now

adds, that he has also found it in some of the samples of the ordinary Gipsy language of England, as he has taken it from the mouth of English Gipsies.

He considers it to be a personal rather than a philological characteristic, certain individuals having a *minimum* amount of abstracting power, and such individuals being inordinately common amongst the American Indians.

ON THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS AND NUMERALS OF THE MALLICOLLO AND ERROMANGO LANGUAGES.

BY THE REVEREND C. ABRAHAM.

COMMUNICATED WITH REMARKS

TO THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY

BY DR. R. G. LATHAM.

APRIL 22. 1853.

MALLICOLO OR SESOK?

MALLICOLO.	ENGLISH.	MALLICOLO.	ENGLISH.
Inau,	I	*urare*,	child.
khai-im,	you.	*aramomau*,	father.
na-ü,	he.	*nebök*,	a man.
na-mühl, *drivan*	we two. exclus. / inclus.	*bauenunk*,	a male.
		rambaiük,	a female.
kha-mühl,	you two.	*marīu*,	the sun, also their name for God.
na-taroi,	you three.		
na-tavatz,	you four.		
dra-tin,	we three.	*tepe*,	worship.
dra-tovatz.	we four.	*nakambu*,	fire.
		ewoi,	yes.
si-kat,	one.	*emwe*,	not.
e-ua,	two.	*nelumbai*, *tatanini*,	know.
e-roi,	three.		
e-vatz,	four.	*dratiban*,	go.
e-rima,	five.	*utoi*,	language.
su-kai,	six.	*ampreusi*,	see.
whi-u,	seven.	*tipen agene*,	shoot arrows.
o-roi,	eight.	*to perito na bara*,	throw stones.
whi-vatz,	nine.		
singeap,	ten.	*no kani wangas isank*,	I eat good food.

ERROMANGO.

ERROMANGO.	ENGLISH.	ERROMANGO.	ENGLISH.
I au,	I.	*kosengu*,	we.
kik,	you.	*kimingu*,	ye.
iyi,	he.	*irara*,	they.
enn-iau,	my.	*ngaraodlem*,	ten.
ennun-kik,	thy.		
enn-ii,	his.	*nobu*,	God.
ennun-kos,	our.	*natamas*,	spirit.
ennun-kimi,	your.	*etemen*,	father.
enn-irara,	their.	*tan niteni*,	son.
sai-imou,	this.	*tinema*,	mother.
sai-nempe,	that.	*etemetallari*,	man.
aramai,	good.	*tiamesu*,	thing.
tagraubuki,	bad.	*ei*,	yes.
		taui,	no.
saitavan,	one.	*navang*,	eat.
du-ru,	two.	*hamonuki*,	drink.
tesal,	three.	*akasè*,	see.
menda-vat,	four.	*nimint*,	eyes.
suku-ring,	five.	*lebetanlop*,	finger.
sikai,	six.	*warakclang*,	nose.
suku-rimnaro,	seven.	*telangunt*,	ear.
suku-rintesal,	eight.	*lampunt*,	hair.
suku-rimendarat,	nine.	*kikome*,	name.

REMARKS.

Since these vocabularies were laid before the Society, a "Journal of a Cruise among the Islands of the Western Pacific," by Capt. J. E. Erskine, R. N., has been published. This shows the sources of the preceding lists; since the bishop of New Zealand accompanied the expedition, and succeeded in taking back with him, on his return, some youths for the purposes of education.

The class to which these vocabularies belong has never been, sufficiently for the purposes of publication, reduced to writing, nor is any member of it known to scholars in general, in respect to its grammatical structure. This, however, will probably not be the case much longer, since Capt. Erskine has placed the materials for the study of the Aneitum (Annatom) language in the hands of Mr. Norriss, who is prepared for its investigation. Neither has the class been wholly neglected. A grammar of the Tanna (an allied language) was drawn up by Mr. Heath, but it has not been published, and is probably lost. Dr. Pritchard, who had seen extracts from it, writes, that it contained a *trinal* as

well as a *singular*, a *dual*, and a *plural* number. The present list elucidates this. The *trinal* number (so-called) of the Mallicolo is merely the personal pronoun *plus* the numeral 3; each element being so modified as to give the appearance of an inflection.

The following tables exhibit the numerals of certain other islands in the neighbourhood. They are taken from Captain Erskine's work, in which reference is made to a "Description of the Islands in the Western Pacific Ocean, by A. Cheyne." This has not been examined by the present writer.

	Isle of							
Eng.	Tana.	Fotuna*.	Pines.	Uea.	Uea.	Yengen.	Balad.	Lifu.
one.	li-ti	ta-si	ta.	tahi	pacha	hets	par-ai	chas.
two.	ka-ru	rua.	vo	lua.	lo	he-luk.	par-roo	lu-ete.
three.	ka-har.	toru	ve-ti.	tolu	kuu	he-yen	par-gen	kun-ete.
four.	ke-fa.	fa.	beu.	fa	thack	po-bits	par-bai	ek-ete.
five	ka-rirum	rima	ta-hue	lima	thabumb	nim	pa-nim	tibi.
six.	liti (?)	ono.	no-ta.	tahi	lo-acha	nim-wet.	par-ai	chb-lemen.
seven.	ka-ru (?)	fitu	no-bo	lua.	lo-alo	nim-weluk	par-roo	luen-gemen.
eight.	ka-han ?)	varu	no-beti.	tolu	lo-kunn	nim-weyen	par-gen	kun-engemen.
nine	ke-fa (?)	iva.	no-beu.	fa	lo-thack.	nim-pobit	par-bai	ske-ngemen.
ten.	ka-rirum?	tanga-fieru.	de-kau.	lima	te-bennete	pain-duk	pa-nim	lue-ipe.

Mr. Abraham's Mallicolo represents the same language with the Mallicolo vocabulary of Captain Cook's Voyages, with which it pretty closely agrees.

His Erromango is more peculiar. *Sikai* = six = the Mallicolo *sukai*, which is, itself, nearly the *sikai* = one. The *-ring* in suku-*ring*, too, is the Mallicolo *rima*. This we know, from the analogies of almost all the languages of Polynesia and the Indian Archipelago, to be the word *lima* = *hand*. Hence e-*rima* (Mallicolo), *hand*, and suku-*ring* (Erromango) = *one hand*. The *vat* in menda-*vat* is the Mallicolo *-bats* in e-*bats*, the Malay am-*pat* = *four*. Du-*ru* is the Mallicolo e-*ry*, there being in each case a prefixed syllable. The analysis of *tesal* and *saitavan* is less clear. Neither is it certain how *ngaraodlen* = *ten*. The other numerals are compounds. This, perhaps, is sufficient to show that the difference between the numerals of the Mallicolo and Erromango is a difference of a very superficial kind. So it is with the Tana, Fotuna, and the first Uea specimens. We must always remember that the first syllable is generally a non-radical prefix.

In the Tana of the preceding table, the words for 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, seem to be merely the words for 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 repeated, and something of the same kind appears in the first Uea. Perhaps the representation may be imperfect. At any rate the Tanna of Cook's Voyage runs —

* Or Erronan. The Nuia or Immer numerals are the same.

Eng.	Tanna.	Eng.	Tanna.
one	r-eedee.	*three*	ka-har.
two	ka-roo.	*four.*	kai-phar.
five	k-reerum.	*eight.*	*ma*-ka-har.
six	*ma*-r-eedee.	*nine*	*ma*-kai-phar.
seven	*ma*-ka-roo.	*ten*	*ma*-k-reerum.

The same appears in the Balad of New Caledonia. Now Cooks New Caledonian runs —

Eng.	New Caledonian.	Eng.	New Caledonian.
one	*wa*-geeaing.	*six*	*wa*-nnim-geeek.
two	*wa*-roo.	*seven*	*wa*-nnim-noo.
three	*wa*-teen.	*eight.*	*wa* nnim-gain.
four.	*wa*-mbaeek.	*nine*	*wa*-nnim-baeek.
five	*wa*-nnim.	*ten*	*wa*-nnim-aiuk.

The Yengen and Lifu vocabularies are not so different but that the *lu* and *kun* of the one = the *luk* and *yen* of the other, as well as the *lo* and *kiuu* of the second Uea, and the *roo* and *gen* of the Balad.

The importance of these non-radical syllables in the numerals has been indicated by the present writer in the appendix to Mr. M'Gillivray's 'Voyage of the Rattlesnake.' There we find several well-selected specimens of the languages of the Louisiade archipelago. The fact of certain affinities between these and the New Caledonian is there indicated. Each has its prefix. In each the prefix is a *labial*.

English.	Two.
Louisiade	*paihe*-tuan.
New Caledonia	*wa*-teen &c.

Now the Tana and Mallicolo tongues have a prefix also, but this is not a labial. It is rather a vowel or *k* (guttural or palatal). Here lies a difference — a difference of detail. Yet the same change can now be shown to be within the pale of the New Caledonian itself, as may be seen by comparing *par*-roo and *par*-gen (*pah*-gen?) with *he*-luk and *he*-yen.

The change from *r* to *l* creates no difficulty. In one of the Tana vocabularies *one* = *li*-ti, in another *r*-eedee.

These points have been gone into for the sake of guarding against such exaggeration of the differences between the languages of the parts in question as the *apparent* differences in the numerals have a tendency to engender.

AMERICA.

(NORTH).

ON THE LANGUAGES OF THE OREGON TERRITORY.

READ

BEFORE THE ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY

ON THE 11TH DECEMBER 1844.

The languages dealt with are those that lie between Russian America and New California. It is only, however, such as are spoken on the sea-coast and on the American frontier that are fairly known to us. Concerning some of the latter, such as the Blackfoot, the notices are deferred. Little, in the present state of our knowledge, can be attempted beyond the mere verification of vocabularies. In his list, however, of these, the writer has attempted to be exhaustive.

It is convenient to enumerate these vocabularies separately and to proceed from North to South.

Queen Charlotte's Island. — The two chief vocabularies are Mr Tolmie's and Messrs Sturgin and Bryant's, in the Journal of the Geographical Society and the Archæologia Americana respectively. They represent different dialects.

English.	Sturgin & Bryant.	Haidahof, Tolmie.
Man	keeset	kleilhatsta
Woman	kna, ana	tsata
Canoe	cloo	kloo
Tobacco	qull	quil
Water	huntle	huntle
Sun	tzue	shandlain

English.	Sturgin & Bryant.	Haldahof, Tolmie.
Moon	kuhn	khough
Rain	tull	tull
Snow	tull hatter	dhanw
Dog	hah	hootch
Bear	tunn	tann
T.	cagen	teea
Thou	tinkyah	tungha

With these, the few words in the Mithridates coincide

	Mithridates.	Tolmie.
One	sounchou	squansung
Two	stonk	stung
Three	sloonis	klughunnil

Chimmesyan. — Mr Tolmie's vocabulary — Journal of Geographical Society. Spoken between 53° 30′ and 55° 30′ N. L.

Billechoola. — Mr Tolmies vocabulary; *ibid.* Spoken on the Salmon River.

Friendly Village. — In Mackenzie's Travels, we find a few words from a tribe on the Salmon River. Their locality is called by Mackenzie the *Friendly Village*. By the aid of Mr Tolmie's vocabularies, we can now place this hitherto unfixed dialect. It belongs to the Billechoola tongue.

English.	Friendly Village.	Billechoola.
Salmon	zimilk	shimilk
Dog	watts	watz
House	zlaachle	shmool'
Bark-mat	zemnez	.....
Cedar-bark-blanket	.....	tzummi
Beaver	couloun	couloun
Stone	dichts	quilstolomick
Water	ulkan	kullah
Mat	gistcom	stuchom
Bonnet	ilcaette	kayeete

Fitz-Hugh Sound. — For these parts we possess only the numerals. They coincide most with the Haeltzuk, a language that will next be noticed. The termination in *skum* is common to the Fitz-Hugh Sound and the Blackfoot numerals.

English,	*two.*
F. Sound,	malscum.
Haeltzuk,	malook.

English,	*three.*
F. Sound,	utascum.
Haeltzuk,	yootook.
English,	*four.*
F. Sound,	moozcum.
Haeltzuk,	moak.
Billechoola,	moash.
English,	*five.*
F. Sound,	thekaescum
Haeltzuk,	skeowk.
Billechoola,	tzeiuch.
English,	*six.*
F. Sound,	kitliscum.
Haeltzuk,	katlowk.
English,	*seven.*
F. Sound,	atloopooskum.
Haeltzuk,	malthlowsk.
English,	*ten.*
F. Sound,	highioo.
Haeltzuk,	aikas.

Haeltzuk. — Mr Tolmie's vocabulary. Spoken from 50° 30′ to 53° 30′ N. L. — *Journal of Geograph. Soc.*

Quadra and Vancouver's Island — Nootka Sound. — For these parts we have several vocabularies.

1. The Numerals. — From Dixon — *Mithridates*, iii., 2, 115.

2. King George's Sound. — The Numerals, *Mith.*, iii., 2, 115.

3. *Mozino's* MS. *Vocabulary.* — See *Mith.*, iii., 2.

4. *Captain Cook's Vocabulary.* — This is comparatively copious. It represents the same language with the three preceding.

5. The Tloaquatch vocabulary of Mr Tolmie. *Journ. of Geog. Soc.* — This certainly represents, as is truly stated by Dr. Scouler, the same language as the Nootka-Sound vocabulary of Cook.

English.	Cook's Nootka.	Tolmie's Tlaoquatch.
Sky	naas	naase
Mountain	noohchai	notcheh
House	mahtai	maas
Paddle	oowhabbie	oowhapie
Canoe	shapats	tshappits
Water	chauk	tchaak
Go	cho	tcha-alche

English.	Cook's Nootka.	Tolmie's Tlaoquatch.
Run	kummiitchchut	kumitkok
Bow	moostatte	moastatit
Arrow	tsechatte	tzehatite
Knife	kotyok	tzokquaeek
Man	tanass	tanais

6. Straits of Fuca. — A short vocabulary taken during the voyage of the *Sutil y Mexicana* — *Archæol. Amer.*, ii., 306. Is not this Mozino's?

7. The Wakash vocabulary of Jewitt. — *Archæol. Amer.*, ii. 306.

English.	Fuca.	Tlaoquatch.	Wakash.
Water	ihaac	tchaak	chahak
Sky	tacuihamach	naase	sieyah
Stars	uliusac	taastass	tartoose
Moon	ilajudshashitle	hopulh	oophelth
Sun	dagina	tlopil	oophetlh
Ear	pipi	.....	parpee

Kawitchen. — Spoken at the entrance of Trading River opposite Vancouver's Island. Mr Tolmie's vocabulary. — See *Journal of Geograph. Societ.*

Noosdalum. — Spoken in Hood's Channel. — *Ibid.*

The Atna of Mackenzie. — This we may now place. It resembles the Noosdalum, with dialectal differences.

English.	Atnah.	Noosdalum.
Man	scuynlouch	sohwieken
Woman	smosledgensk	sheeakatso
Beaver	schugh	skyauw
Dog	scacah	skacha
Water	shaweliquoih	kah
Plains	spilela	spilchun
Here	thlaelych	lilkaa
Iron	soucoumang	halaitan
Bow	isquoinah	schomotun
Arrow	squaili	ytsh tzimaan

In Baer's *Statistische und Ethnographische Nachrichten über die Russischen Besitzungen an der Nordwestküste von Amerika*, we find a second vocabulary named *Atna*. This is spoken on the Copper River in Russian America, and represents a different language from the Atna of Mackenzie. Both, however, belong to the same* group. The plausible mode of

* This is inaccurate — See following papers.

accounting for this coincidence, is to suppose that two tribes named themselves *men*, which throughout the Athabascar languages is expressed by the root *t–n*, as *dinnie*, *tenni*, *tnain*, &c.

Squallyamish. — Spoken at Puget's Sound. Mr Tolmie in T. G. S.

Chenook. — For the important languages of the Chenook or Flathead Indians on the river Columbia, we have the following *data:*

1. Franchere's vocabulary; *Archæol. Americana*, ii., 379.
2. Parker's vocabulary; communicated in M. S., by A. Gallatin to Dr Prichard.
3. Cathlascou of Tolmie, J. G. S.
4. Chenook of Tolmie, *ibid.*

Of these vocabularies the Chenook of Parker and Franchere coincide closely. Parker's Chenook, compared with the two vocabularies of Tolmie, agrees most with the Cathlascou.

Kalapooiah. — This tribe is placed by Parker on the Multomah river. According to Tolmie, their language is spoken on the Wallamat Plains.

1. Tolmie's vocabulary. J. G. S.
2. Parker's vocabulary. M. S. from Gallatin to Dr Prichard.

The two vocabularies represent one and the same language.

Okanagan. — Spoken on Fraser's River. Mr Tolmie's vocabulary. The Okanagan vocabulary enables us to fix the following one:

The Salish. — This is an anonymous vocabulary from Duponceau's collection. *Archæolog. Americ.*, ii, 306. It is evidently closely akin to the Okanagan.

English.	Salish.	Okanagan.
Man	ckeltamaiuh	.....
Woman	.....	tukulthlimeilooch
Canoe	'tleagh	slalthleim
Stars.	ko'kusmh	hohooos
Rain	steepais	tepais
Snow	amaikut	smakoot
Water	saioolkh	sauwulh
Mountain	aitzumkummok	atzimmok
Deer	atsooleea	.....
Roebuck	.....	klatzeenim
Bear	c'summaitshui	skummachist
Wolf	n'tsseetsan	nutzetzim
One	neo	nuchs
Two	essel	uskul

English.	Salish.	Okanagan.
Three	tsailhis	kaalthleis
Four	mos	moas
Five	tseel	koheil
Seven	seespil	sheespil
Ten	opan	opuniet

Kliketat. Spoken between Fort Nez Perce's, Mount Rainier, and the Columbia Falls.

1. Mr Tolmie's vocabulary.

2. Mr Parker's vocabulary M. S. from Gallatin to Dr Prichard.

These represent allied dialects of the same language.

Shahaptan, Nez Perce's. — It is truly stated by Gallatin that the Shahaptan and Kliketat languages are allied.

1. Mr Tolmie's vocabulary.

2. Mr Parker's vocabulary M. S. from Gallatin to Dr Prichard.

Jamkallie. Spoken near the sources of the Wallamat, Mr Tolmie's vocabulary.

Umpqua. — On the river so called. Mr Tolmie's vocabulary.

This is the most southern point for which we possess Oregon vocabularies.

Four more vocabularies complete the enumeration of our *data* for the parts in question.

1. *Shoshonie* or *Snake Indians.* — The first is a southern or central one, the Shoshonie or Snake vocabulary, collected by Say, and representing a language south of that of the Nez Perces. *Archæol. Americ.*, ii. 306.

2. *Sussee.* — The Sussee of Umfreville, is either spoken within the Oregon Territory, or within the districts immediately to the north of it.

3. *The Nagail* — See *Mackenzie's Travels.*

4. *The Taculli* — See *Archæol. Americ.*, ii. 305.

Such are the vocabularies for the Oregon Territory of North America. In number they amount to forty-one. Dealing with speech as the instrument of intercourse, it is highly probable that these vocabularies may represent as many as nineteen different languages, that is, modes of speech, mutually unintelligible. Dealt with, however, ethnologically, their number is evidently capable of being reduced.

In the present state of our knowledge, it is convenient to leave the Shoshonie language* unplaced. All that we

* Since this statement was read, the author has been enabled, through the means of a Cumanche vocabulary, with which he was favoured by Mr

possess of it is the vocabulary noticed above. It consists of only twenty-four words. Their affinities (such as they are) are miscellaneous

English,	*beaver.*
Shoshonie,	hanish.
Chenook,	eena.
Haidah,	tzing
Cathlascou,	kanook.
English,	*salmon.*
Shoshonie,	augi.
Haidah,	swaggan.
English,	*horse.*
Shoshonie,	bunko.
Blackfoot,	pinnechometar.
.....	pennakomet.
English,	*woman*,
Shoshonie,	wepee.
Souriquois,	meboujou.
Penobscot,	m'phenim.
Micmac,	epit.
Echemin,	apet.
Pima,	uba.
Calapooiah,	apomeik.
English,	*friend.*
Shoshonie,	hauts.
Chetimacha,	keta.
Onondago,	ottie.
English,	*water.*
Shoshonie,	pa.
New Sweden,	bij.
Algonkin,	ne-pi, *passim.*
English,	*good.*
Shoshonie,	saut.
Shahaptan,	tautz.
Pima,	tiuot.
Chocta,	chito = *great.*
Crow,	esah = *great.*
.....	bassats = *many.*

Bollaert, to determine that these two languages are allied. (This was written in 1845. Since, then, the evidence that the Shoshoni and Cumanch belong to the same family has become conclusive.)

English,	*go.*
Shoshonie,	numeraro.
Kawitchen,	namilthla.
English,	*come.*
Shoshonie,	keemak.
Nez Perces,	come.
English,	*awl.*
Shoshonie,	weeu.
Ahnenin,	bay.
English,	*no.*
Shoshonie,	kayhee.
Ahnenin,	chieu.
Potowotami,	cho.
Ojibbeway,	kaw.
Ottawa,	kaween.
Old Algonkin,	kah.
Chetimacha,	kahie.

It is also advisable to deal cautiously with the Sussee language. Umfreville's vocabulary is short, and consisting almost exclusively of the names of articles of commerce. Lists of this sort are of little value in ethnography. Still, upon the whole, it confirms the current opinion as to the place of the Sussee language, viz. that it is * Athabascan. At any rate, it has certain miscellaneous affinities.

English,	*eye.*
Sussee,	senouwoh.
Kenay,	snaga.
Taculli,	onow.
Chipewyan,	nackhay.
English,	*five.*
Sussee,	coo.
Chipewyan,	coun.
English,	*kettle.*
Sussee,	usaw.
Taculli,	osa.
English,	*axe.*
Sussee,	chilthe.
Taculli,	chachil.

* The evidence of this being the case has since become conclusive. — 1859.

English,	*knife.*
Sussee,	marsh.
Illinois,	mariesa.
Minitari,	matse.
English,	*shoes.*
Sussee,	siscau.
Taculli,	kiscot.
English,	*one.*
Sussee,	uttegar.
Eskimo,	attowseak.
.....	adaitsuk.
.....	adoajak.
.....	atamek.
English,	*three.*
Sussee,	tauky.
Kenai,	tohchke.
Taculli,	toy.
Chipewyan,	taghy.
English,	*four.*
Sussee,	tachey.
Kenai,	tenki.
Taculli,	tingkay.
Chipewyan,	dengky.
English,	*seven.*
Sussee,	checheta.
Mohawk,	chahtahk.
Onondago,	tschoatak.
Seneca,	jawdock.
Oneida,	tziadak.
Nottoway,	ohatay.
English,	*ten.*
Sussee,	cuneesenunnee.
Chipewyan,	canothna.

Laying these two languages aside, and reserving the Blackfoot for future inquiries, the other vocabularies are referrible to two recognized groups. The Nagail and Taculli are what Gallatin calls *Athabascan*. All the* rest are what Prichard calls *Nootka-Columbian*. Respecting the former class, the evidence is unequivocal, and the fact generally admitted. Respecting the latter, the statement requires consideration.

At first glance, Mr Tolmie's vocabularies differ materially

* The Umqua has since been shewn to be the Athabaskan — 1859.

from each other; and only a few seem less unlike each other than the rest. Such are the Kliketat and Shahaptan, the Calapooiah and Yamkallie, the Kawitchen and Tlaoquatch, the Chenook and Cathlascou. Besides this, the general difference between even the allied vocabularies is far more visible than the general resemblance. Finally, the numerals and the fundamental terms vary in a degree beyond what we are prepared for, by the study of the Indo-European tongues.

Recollecting, however, the compound character of the most fundamental words, characteristic of all the American language; recognising, also, as a rule of criticism, that in the same class of tongues the evidence of the numerals is unimportant in the determination of *differences*, and comparing the sixteen Oregon vocabularies of Mr Tolmie with each other, we may satisfy ourselves as to the radical unity of the group. To these lists, and to the accompanying paper of Dr. Scouler, reference is accordingly made. The *value* of these groups (the Athabascan and the Nootka-Columbian) is a different and a more difficult question. The *maximum* difference between any two known languages of the Athabascan group is that between English and German. The *maximum* difference between the most unlike languages of the Nootka-Columbian group is that between the modern Greek and Portuguese, *i. e.* the most distant tongues of the classical stock of the Indo-European tribe. Hence, the terms in question are equivalent to the more familiar terms, *Gothic*, *Celtic*, *Slavonic*, &c. All this, however, is illustration, rather than absolute arrangement; yet it serves to give definitude to the current opinions upon the subject.

To the current views, however, the writer takes exception. He considers that the groups in question have too high a value; and that they are only equivalent to the primary subdivisions of *stocks* like the Gothic, Celtic, and Classical, rather than to the stocks themselves. Still less can they have a higher and more exaggerated value, and be dealt with as equivalent to groups like the *Indo-European*.

Hence, the differences between the Athabascan languages of the Oregon and the Nootka-Columbian languages of the Oregon, are the differences between the Latin and Greek, the Welsh and Gaelic, the German and Icelandic, rather than those between the German and Russian, the Latin and Persian, the Greek and Lithuanic, &c.

In determining the higher and more comprehensive class, we must take in a third group of languages. These are those of Russian America. They have generally been referred to two groups of uncertain value, viz. the Kolooch and the

Eskimo; the former, for the part about Sitca, or Norfolk Sound, the latter for the parts about the Island of Cadiack, and the Peninsula of Aliaska.

Now, the Athabascan languages are undoubtedly Eskimo; a fact stated by the writer, at the meeting of the British Association at York, and founded upon the comparison of the Athabascan vocabularies of Mackenzie and Dobbs, on the one side, with the Western Eskimo ones, on the other.

And the Kolooch languages are equally Eskimo with the Athabascan. This may be seen by reference to Lisiansky's vocabularies, and a comparison between the Sitca and Cadiack.

English.	Sitca.	Cadiack.
Cry	kaáh	keyya
Drink	itanna	tanha
Hail	katelst	koudat
Knee	kakeek	chiskoohka
Lake	aaka	nanoak
Lips	kahaka	hlukha
Man	chakleyh	shook
Spark	heeklya	chatalahi
Wind	keelhcha	kyaeek

Now, by taking in the Eskimo of the Aleutian Islands, this list might be doubled; and by dealing with the Kenay as Eskimo, it might be trebled.

Again, by attempting to fix the points whereat the Eskimo language ceases, and the Kolooch tongue begins, we may get further evidence that the difference between them is exaggerated; since the languages passed by gradual transitions into each other.

What follows, moreover, is cumulative evidence towards the same conclusion.

Over and above the vocabularies collected by Mr Tolmie that have already been dealt with, there is a seventeenth, viz. the *Tunghaas*. This is stated in Dr Scouler's accompanying paper to be the most northern dialect with which the Hudson's Bay traders come in contact. It is also stated to be Sitcan; and that truly.

English.	Tunghaas.	Sitca.
Sea-otter	youchtz	youtch
River-otter	coostah	kooshta
Bear	hooctch	hoots
Whale	yioagh	yaaga
Woman	shewat	shavvot

English.	Tunghaas.	Sitca.
Summer	kootaan	kootaan
He	yout	youta
Good	ahkeh	tooake

On the other hand, the Tonghaas has affinities with the Haidah of Queen Charlotte's Island, and through it with the so-called Nootka-Columbian languages in general.

Cumulative, in the way of evidence to this, is the statement, with the verification of which we shall conclude, viz., that, besides the Athabascan, the other languages of the Oregon Territory have affinities with the Eskimo. With the Oonalashkan and Cadiack on the one side, and with Mr Tolmie's vocabularies (with Cook's occasionally) *en masse* on the other, we have at least the following words common to the two groups.

English, *sky.*
Cook's Nootka, eenaeel nas.
Tlaoquatch, naase.
Oonalashka, anneliak = *day.*

English, *sky.*
Haidah, shing.
Billechoola, skoonook = *day.*
Haidah, yen = *clouds.*
Haeeltzuk, unnowie.
Oonalashka, youyan = *sky.*
..... innyak = *sky.*

English, *moon.*
Billechoola, tlooki.
Cadiack, yaalock.

English, *snow.*
Haeeltz, naie.
Calapooah, anoopeik.
Yamkallie, kanopeik.
Cadiack, annue.
Oonalashka, kannue.

English, *hail.*
Haidah, dhanw = *snow.*
Oonalashka, tahenem dahskeeto.

English, *water.*
Cook's Nootka, chauk.
Tlaoquatch, tchaak.
Cadiack, kooyk = *river.*

English,	*river.*
Tloaquatch,	aook.
Cadiack,	alaook = *sea.*
English,	*rain.*
Calapooiah,	tochtocha.
Cadiack.	kedoh.
Oonalashka,	chetak.
English,	*sand.*
Haidah,	il kaik.
Oonalashka,	choohok.
English,	*mountain.*
Kliketat,	pannateet
Cadiack,	poonhokanlie.
English,	*house.*
Kliketat,	needh.
Shahaptan,	eneedh.
Cadiack,	naa.
English.	*song.*
Cook's Nootka,	oonook.
Oonalashka,	oonoohada = *sing.*
English,	*go.*
Cook's Nootka,	cho.
Oonalashka,	icha.
English,	*cleave, cut.*
Cook's Nootka,	tsook.
Cadiack,	chaggidzu.
Oonalashka,	toohoda.
English,	*crow.*
Cook's Nootka,	kaenne.
Cadiack,	kâlnhak.
English,	*fire.*
Cook's Nootka,	eeneek.
Cadiack,	knok.
Oonalashka,	keynak.
English,	*skull.*
Cook's Nootka,	koometz.
Oonalashka,	kamhek.
English,	*teeth.*
Cook.s Nootka,	cheecheetsh.
Cadiack,	hoodeit.

English,	*middle finger.*
Cook's Nootka,	taceai.
Cadiack,	teekha.
English,	*how much.*
Haeeltzuck,	kinshook.
Kawitchen,	quien.
Noosdalum,	quien.
Oonalashka,	kannahen.
Cadiack,	kouhcheen.
English,	*mat.*
Chenook,	swussak.
Shahaptan,	tooko.
Oonalashka,	sootok.
English,	*bow.*
Okanagan,	tsukquenuk.
Oonalashka,	saeheek.
English,	*house.*
Squallyamish,	aalall.
Oonalashka,	oolon.
English,	*iron.*
Squallyamish,	kumnuttin.
Cadiack,	komlyahook.
English,	*sea-otter.*
Billechoola,	qunnee.
Oonalashka,	cheenatok.
English,	*bear.*
Haidah,	tan.
Oonalashka,	tanhak.

To this list a previous statement applies more especially. By treating the Sitca and Kenay vocabularies as Eskimo, the number of coincidences might have been doubled.

Besides this, it must be remembered that, in Tolmie's vocabularies, no terms expressive of the different parts of human body are given; and that several names of the commonest objects are wanting, *e. g. fire,* &c.

Neither have the vocabularies of Wrangell for the varied dialects of Russian America been made use of.

As the lists, however, stand, the author considers that he has shewn reason for believing that the Athabascan, the Kolooch, the Nootka-Columbian, and the Cadiack groups are subordinate members of one large and important class — the Eskimo; a fact which, coinciding with all his other inquiries

in American Ethnology, breaks down, further than has hitherto been done, the broad and trenchant line of demarcation between the circumpolar and the other Indians of the Western Continent.

NOTES.

Note 1.

In a valuable paper On the Tribes inhabiting the N. W. Coast of America read a few weeks afterwards by Dr. J. Scouler the following tables shewed —

1. The fact that the Nutka forms of speech were to be found on the Continent;
2. That the Wallawalla was Sahaptin.

a.

English.	Tlaoq. & Nootka.	Columbia.
Plenty	Aya,	Haya
No	Wik,	Wake
Water	Tchaak,	Chuck
Good	Hooleish,	Closh
Bad	Peishakeis,	Peshak
Man	Tchuckoop,	Tillicham
Woman	Tlootsemin,	Clootchamen
Child	Tanassis,	Tanass
Now	Tlahowich,	Clahowiah
Come	Tchooqua,	Sacko
Slave	Mischemas,	Mischemas
What are you doing?	Akoots-ka-mamok,	Ekta-mammok
What are you saying?	Au-kaak-wawa,	Ekta-wawa?
Let me see	Nannanitch	Nannanitch
Sun	Opeth,	Ootlach
Sky	Sieya,	Saya
Fruit	Chamas,	Camas
To sell	Makok,	Makok
Understand	Commatax,	Commatax

b.

English.	Shahaptan.	Wallawalla.	Kliketat.
Man	Nama	Winsh	Wins
Boy	Naswae	Tahnutshint	Aswan
Woman	Aiat	Tilahi	Aiat
Girl	Piten	Tohauat	Pitiniks
Wife	Swapna	Asham	Asham
Child	Miahs	Isht	Mianash
Father	Pishd	Pshit	Pshit
Mother	Pika	Ptsha	Ptsha
Friend	Likstiwa	Hhai	Hhai

English.	Shahaptan.	Wallawalla.	Kliketat.
Fire	Ala	Sluksh	Sluks
Water	Tkush	Tshush	Tshaush
Wood	Hatsin	Slukas	Slukuas
Stone	Pishwa	Pshwa	Pshwa
Ground	Watsash	Titsham	Titsham
Sun	Wishamtuksh	Au	Au
Moon	——	Ailhai	Ailhai
Stars	Witsein	Haslu	Haslo
Clouds	Spalikt	Pashst	——
Rain	Wakit	Sshhauit	Tohtoha
Snow	Maka	Poi	Maka
Ice	Tahask	Tahauk	Toh
Horse	Shikam	Kusi	Kusi
Dog	Shikamkan	Kusi Kusi	Kusi Kusi
Buffalo	Kokulli	Musmussin	Musmussin
Male Elk	Wawakia	Wawakia	Winat
Female Elk	Taship	Tashipka	Winat
Grey Bear	Pahas	Wapantle	——
Black Bear	Jaka	Saka	Analmi
House	Snit	Snit	Snit
Gun	Timuni	Tainpas	Tuilpas
Body	Silaks	Waunokshash	——
Head	Hushus	Tilpi	Palka
Arm	Atim	Kamkas	——
Eyes	Shilhu	Atshash	Atshash
Nose	Nathnu	Nathnu	Nosnu
Ears	Matsaia	Matsiu	——
Mouth	Him	Em	Am
Teeth	Tit	Tit	——
Hands	Spshus	Spap	Alla
Feet	Ahwa	Waha	Waha
Legs	Wainsh	Tama	——
Mocassens	Heapkat	Shkam	Shkam
Good	Tahr	Skeh	Shoeah
Bad	Kapshish	Milla	Tshailwit
Hot	Sakas	Sahwaih	Sahweah
Cold	Kenis	Kasat	Tewisha Kasat
Far	Waiat	Wiat	Wiat
Near	Keintam	Tsiwas	Tsa
High	Tashti	Hwaiam	Hweami
Low	Ahat	Smite	Niti
White	Naihaih	Koik	Olash
Black	Sunuhsimuh	Tshimuk	Tsimuk
Red	Sepilp	Sutsha	Sutsa
Here	Kina	Tshna	Stshiuak
There	Kuna	Kuna	Skone
Where?	Minu?	Mina?	Mam
When?	Mana?	Mun?	Mun?
What?	Mish?	Mish?	Mish?
Why?	Manama?	Maui?	——
Who?	Ishi?	Skiu?	Skiu?
Which?	Ma?	Mam?	——
How much?	Mas?	Milh?	Milh?
So much	Kala	Kulk	Skulk
How far?	Miwail?	Maal?	——
So far	Kewail	Kwal	——

English.	Shahaptan.	Wallawalla.	Kliketat.
How long?	Mahae?	Maalh	——
To long	Kohae	Kwalk	——
This	Ki	Tshi	Tshi
That	Joh	Kwa	Skwa
I	Su	Su	Suk
You	Sui	Sui	Suik
He she, it	Ipi	Ipin	Pink
We	Nun	Nama	Nemak
Ye	Ima	Ena	Imak
They	Ema	Ema	Pamak
To go	Kusha	Winasha	Winasha
To see	Hakesha	Hoksha	——
So say	Heisha	Nu	Nu
To talk	Tseksa	Siniwasa	Sinawasa
To walk	Wenasa	Winashash	——
To read	Wasasha	Wasasha	Wasasha
To eat	Wipisha	Kwatashak	——
To drink	Makosha	Matshushask	——
To sleep	Pinimiksha	Pinusha	——
To wake	Waksa	Tahshisask	Tahshasha
To love	Watanisha	Tkeshask	Tkehsha
To take	Paalsa	Apalashask	——
To know	Lukuasa	Ashakuashash	Shukuasha
To forget	Titolasha	Slakshash	——
To give	Inisha	Nishamash	——
To seize	Inpisha	Shutshash	Wanapsha
To be cold	Iswaisa	Sweashash	Iswaiska
To be sick	Komaisa	Painshash	Painsha
To hunt	Tukuliksa	Salaitisas	Nistewasa
To lie	Mishamisha	Tshishkshash	Tshiska
To steal	Pakwasha	Pakwashash	Pakwasha

Note 2.

This, along with the paper on the Ethnology of Russian America, was the development of a communication laid before the Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science at York in the previous September, to the effect that the "line of demarcation drawn "between the Eskimo and the Indian races of America was far too "broad and trenchant"; wherein it was stated. —

1. That the true affinities of the Chipewyan were with the Kadiak, Unalashka, Kenay and Sitka forms of speech. —

2. That the Ugalents (Ugyalyachmutsi of Resanoff), although separated from the neigbouring Eskimot ongues so as to cause the appearance of a discontinuity in the Eskimo area could, when we dealt with the Kadiak, Unalashka, Kenay, and Sitka vocabularies as the representatives of a single language be shown to be Eskimo. —

3. That affinities of a more general kind were to be found even further southward".

4. 5. That the Atna of Mackenzie was the Noosdalum, and the Friendly Village vocabulary the Billechoola, of Mr Tolmie.

(*Transactions of the Sections p. 78. — On the Southern Limits of the Eskimo race in America.*

ON THE ETHNOGRAPHY OF RUSSIAN AMERICA.

READ

BEFORE THE ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY

19TH FEBRUARY 1845.

The paper submitted to the Society is upon the Ethnography of Russian America. For a variety of reasons, the tribes in these parts are of paramount importance. Inhabiting the most north-western extremity of America on the coast of Behring's Straits, they are divided from Asia only by that channel, so that of all the nations of the New World they are most in contact with those of the Old. This circumstance alone puts them prominently forward in ethnology; since the *primâ facie* theory, as to the population of America, must certainly be in favour of the passage having taken place through Behring's Straits.

The limits of the Russian possessions in America, or of the geographical area which we are considering, are not very definitely determined: at least, the line of demarcation is, in a great degree, a political rather than a natural one. From Mount St Elias to the southernmost extremity of Prince of Wales Island, the territory in question consists of a strip of sea-coast, and islands, with the British possessions of New Norfolk and New Hanover at the back; whilst from Mount St Elias northward, as far as the Arctic Sea, the line of division is imaginary, coinciding with the 141° W. long. It can scarcely be expected, that a frontier so determined can coincide with any important divisions, either in physical or ethnographical geography. Still the area in question is a convenient one.

Considering the remote situation of these extensive and inhospitable tracts, the knowledge we possess of them is creditable to the government of Russia. From the time of Behring downward, the coasts have been accurately des-

cribed; whilst the communications of the officials of the Russian American Company exhibit far more than an average amount of intelligence. For such portions of the present paper as are not purely philological, the author has drawn upon Baer's *Statistische und Ethnographische Nachrichten*, &c. Of a Russian settlement in New California, although American, no notice is taken. On the other hand, a nation inhabiting the extreme promontory of Asia (the Tshuktshi) are, for reasons that will make themselves apparent, dealt with as American. On the southern extremity of Russian America, the native tribes are known to their neighbours of New Caledonia, the Oregon country, and to the Hudson's Bay Company, under the names of Colooches, Tunghaases, Atnas, Coltshanies, Ugalentses, Konagis, Cadiacks, Tchugatches, and Kenays. For the north, and the shores of the Arctic Sea, they are dealt with (and that truly) as members of the great Esquimaux family. Further investigation multiplies the names of these tribes, so that we hear of Inkalites, Inkulukhlaites, Kiyataigmutis, Agolegmutes, Pashtolegmutis, Magmutis, &c. &c. To these divisions may be added the different varieties of the natives of the Aleutian islands. In the classification of these numerous tribes, it is considered that much remains to be done.

For the tribes on the shore of the Northern Ocean, and for the parts immediately south of Behring's Straits, the general character, both physical and moral, seems to be Esquimaux. The enormous line of coast over which this nation is extended has long been known. The language and manners of Greenland have been known to us since the times of the earliest Danish missionaries; so that details, both physical and moral, of no savages are better understood than those of the Greenlanders. With this knowledge, it is easy to trace the extension of the race. The shores of Hudson's Bay are inhabited by the same stock. So also is the coast of Labrador. The three forms of speech are but dialects of one language: a fact that has long been known. Hence the Esquimaux and Greenlanders have long been recognised as identical. From Hudson's Bay, northward and westward, the whole line of seacoast, as far as Mackenzie's River, is Esquimaux; and that with but little variety of type; either in physical conformation, manners, or language. The interpreter to Captain Franklin was an Esquimaux from Hudson's Bay, yet he had no difficulty in understanding the dialects west of Mackenzie's River, 137° W. Long. (See *Archæologica Americana*, ii. 11.) Three degrees westward, however, a change in the Esquimaux characteristics takes place;

although the inhabitants of the quarters in question by no means cease to be Esquimaux. The tribes already noticed may be called the Eastern, those about to be mentioned the Western Esquimaux. The dividing line is fixed by Captain Franklin at 140° W. long. The tribes on each side of this line have *at first a great difficulty in understanding each other.* Now the line between the subdivisions of the Esquimaux language coincides very nearly with the boundary line of Russian America. Hence the ethnography of that territory begins with the Western Esquimaux.

It is no refinement to state, that, with the Western Esquimaux, we find a change in the social and moral type, exhibiting itself in a greater appreciation of the articles of civilized life, both as means of home use, and as instruments of commercial barter. They resort annually to the eastern boundary, and exchange articles of Russian manufacture of seals-skins, oil, and furs. This intercourse is of late date. — *Archæologia Americana*, ii., 11.

To Kotzebue's Sound and Behring's Straits the same race, with similar characters, is continued. Of Behring's Straits it occupies *both* sides, the Asiatic as well as the American. From Behring's Straits to the Peninsula of Aliaska, and from thence to Cook's Inlet (or Kenay Bay), every thing is unequivocally Esquimaux, and has long been recognized as such.

That a statement lately made was no refinement, may be proved from the third chapter of Baer's work, where he determines the character of the Esquimaux trade, and gives it as a measure of the intercourse between Asia and America. It seems referable to two centres, viz., the parts about Behring's Straits, and the parts about Cook's Inlet. For the first, the market extends from Icy Cape to the Promontory of Aliaska, and has for its stations the islands of Behring's Straits. The second district comprises the Aleutian islands, Cadiack, and the line of the sea-coast as far south as Queen Charlotte's Island. Now, whatever may be the amount of Russian civilization, in determining some of the characteristics of the Western Esquimaux, it is certain that the tribes of that race now inhabiting Asia, were occupants of their present localities, anterior to the Russian Conquest of Kamshatka.

A second deviation from the Esquimaux type, we find in the island Cadiack, and the coast of the continent opposite. The early Russian discoverers speak of a continual warfare between opposing tribes of the same stock; whilst another tribe, the Inkalite, is said to uphold itself bravely against

the more numerous nation of the Kuskokwims. As a general rule, warfare, except as a defence against tribes of a different race, is as foreign to the typical Esquimaux of Greenland as to the Laplander of Europe.

Measured by another test, and that of the psychological sort (viz., the capacity for religious instruction), the Western Esquimaux coincides with the Esquimaux of Greenland. With the exception, perhaps, of the Negro, the race, in general, is the most docile in respect to the influences of Christianity. The religious history of extreme points of the Aleutian Islands and Greenland verifies this statement.

The extent to which a mixed breed has been propagated under the government of Russia, may be collected from the following tables. In New Archangel the population is as follows: —

Europeans,	406
Creoles or half-breeds,	307
Aleutians,	134

In the remaining part of the territory it is as follows: —

Europeans,	246
Half-breeds,	684
Natives,	8882

Of places of trust in New Archangel, a very large proportion is held by Half-breeds. We find them as overseers, police-officers, clerks, watchmakers, medical students.

Such seem the most remarkable points connected with the Russian Esquimaux in general. They are few in number, because it is the plan of the writer not so much to exhibit the whole details of the race to which they belong, as to put forward prominently such characteristics as are differential to them and the Esquimaux of Greenland and Labrador.

It is now proper to give a brief notice of the more important tribes, these being mentioned separately.

1. *The Tshuktshi.* — This is the name of the Esquimaux of Asia. It is generally accompanied by the epithet *sedentary*, so that we speak of these people as the *sedentary* or *settled* Tshuktshi. This distinguishes them from the so-called *Reindeer Tshuktshi*, a tribe of the Koriak family. For either one or the other of these tribes the name of Tshuktshi should be abolished. It is my impression that the differences between the Esquimo of Asia and America do not represent more than a few centuries of separation.

2. *The Kuskokwim.* — This tribe, which occupies the banks of the river from which it takes its name, may stand as the representative for the tribes between Cape Rodney and

the Peninsula of Aliaska. Its numbers are estimated at upwards of 7000. Transitional in character to the tribes of the coast and interior, its manners coincide with its geographical position. In the use of certain so-called ornaments, it agrees with the other Esquimaux tribes; as it agrees with the Esquimaux and Finn tribes in the use of the sweating-bath. The Kuskoquimers count distance by the number of *nights* requisite for the journey. Of the constellation they have a detailed knowledge, founded upon observations. The most prominent of their institutions is the *Kahim;* a building found in every village, erected like an amphitheatre, capable of containing all the males of the place, and which, over and above many peculiar domestic purposes connected with its erection, serves as a council-hall for the males of the population.

3. *The Tshugatsh.* — Natives of Prince William's Sound, and closely allied to the islanders of Cadiack, with whom they agree in language. Their historical traditions are, that they came from the coast, and from the north; their mythological ones, that they are descended from the Dog.

These three divisions are not only indubitably Esquimaux, but have also been recognised as such.

Those that follow are generally referred to another ethnological group. In the parts about Cook's Inlet (Bay of Kenay) and Mount St Elias, a second race is said to make its appearance, and this is generally separated from the Esquimaux by a broad line of demarcation. It is called the Kolooch race or family, and is generally placed in contrast with the Esquimaux. Isolated tribes akin to the Kolooches, and worthy of special notice, are the following: —

1. *The Ugalyachmusti* or Ugalentses, consisting of about 38 families. — They change their localities with the season, and are Kolooch in manners and conformation. Living around Mount St. Elias they are frontier tribes to the Tshugatshes.

2. *The Kenays*, inhabiting the coast of Cook's Inlet, 460 families strong. — Historically, they assert that their origin is from the hills of the interior, from whence they descended coastward. Their mythological and ultimate origin is from the *raven,* connected with which they have a complex cosmogony. Descent from the *raven*, or descent from the *dog,* is considered, for these tribes we are speaking of, as an instrument in ethnological criticism. Like the Ugalentses, they are in contact with Tshugatsh Esquimaux.

3. *The Atnahs*, dwelling on the Copper River, 60 families strong, hunters of rein-deer, and workers in iron as well

as copper. — They coincide with the typical Kolooches in burning their dead, in ascribing the origin of their race to the *raven*, and in most other particulars.

These three tribes are unequivocally connected closely with each other, and with the other members of the Kolooch group. The position of the following is less definite: —

1. *The Kolshani.* — These represent the natives of the interior. They fall into two divisions, whereof the nearer can make itself intelligible to the Atnas and Kenays. The more distant one is savage, inhospitable, unintelligible. Cannibalism is one of their real or accredited characteristics.

2. *The Inchulukhlaites*, dwelling on the Chulitna River. — They are stated to be akin to the Magimuts, who are allied with,

3. *The Inkalites.* — In one village alone they are 700 strong. Their language is said to be a mixture of the Kenay, Unalashkan, and Atna.

It is hoped that the true character of the ethnological difficulty involved in the classifications of the tribes enumerated, along with several others in the same territory, has suggested itself to the mind of the reader: viz. the position of the undetermined tribes, and the relations of the Esquimaux and the Kolooch groups to each other. These problems seem capable of being solved by means of the evidence of languages. Previous, however, to the enumeration of our data upon this point, it must be observed, that members of a *third* ethnographical division, in all probability, form part of the native population of Russian America. From the Lake Athabasca, as a centre, to the Atlantic on one hand, and to the Pacific on the other, languages of this group are spoken; so that the Athabascan area in its extension from east to west, is second only to the Esquimaux. Now both the Kolooch and Esquimaux languages have fundamental affinities with the Athabascan, and *vice versa;* whilst it is generally the case in Ethnology, that two languages radically connected with a third, are also radically connected with each other. With this premise, we may enumerate in detail, our data in the way of philology. This method will introduce new names and new localities, since we have often vocabularies where we have nothing else besides.

1. *Beechey's Esquimaux.* — The most northern specimen of the western Esquimaux. Spoken in Kotzebue's Sound.

2. The Aglimut vocabulary of the Altas Ethnographique.

3. The Esquimaux of the Island of St Lawrence. — *Ibid.*

4. The Asiatic Esquimaux of the Tshuktshi of Tshuktshi-Noss. Klaproth's Asia Polyglotta.

5. The Asiatic Esquimaux of the Tshuktshi of the mouth of the river Anadyr. — *Ibid.*

6. The Esquimo of Norton Sound. — Cook's Voyages.

7. The Kuskokwimer vocabulary of Baer's Beiträge.

8. A vocabulary of the Island of Nuniwock in the Atlas Ethnographique, is unequivocally Esquimo. So also are the dialects of the Peninsula of Aliaska. Having seen, however, no vocabulary, I am unable to state whether they most resemble those of the Aleutian Islands, (a prolongation of its western extremity), or of those of the Island Cadiack on its south-eastern side. At any rate, the languages akin to the Cadiack, and the languages of the Aleutian group, form separate divisions of sub-dialects. Beginning with the Aleutian class, we have the following materials: —

9. Unalashkan vocabularies by Lisiansky, Wrangell, Resanoff, and others.

10. The Andreanowsky Isles. — Robeck's vocabulary. — See Mithridates.

There is external evidence that the language for the whole Aleutian group is radically one, the differences, however, being, as dialectal differences, remarkable. The natives of Atchu and Unalashka have difficulty in understanding each other. — Mithridates.

11. Cadiack vocabularies by Resanoff, Lisiansky, and Wrangell.

12. Tshugatshi vocabularies by Resanoff and Wrangell.

13. The Lord's Prayer in Jakutat, by Baranoff. — Mithridates.

Notwithstanding the statement that only 19 words out of 1100 are common to the Unalashkan and Cadjak, the affinity of these languages to each other, and their undoubted place in the Esquimaux class, has long been recognised.

14. *The Inkuluklaities.* — This tribe is akin to the Magimut and the Inkalaite. We possess a few words of the language, which are sufficient to prove that although its definite place is undetermined, it has miscellaneous affinities to the Atna, Kenay, and Esquimaux.

15. The Ugalyachmutsi of the Mithridates.

16. The Ugalents of Wrangell. — See Baer's Beiträge. These two vocabularies represent the same language. The Ugalyachmutsi, although left by Resanoff as an isolated language, is unequivocally stated by Baer to be Kolooch. Its contrast with the Esquimaux of the Tshugatshes, has always been insisted on.

17. Kenay vocabularies by Davidoff, Resanoff, Lisiansky, and Wrangell; also an anonymous one from a native. Gal-

latin, in the Archæologia Americana, goes so far as to separate the Kenay even from the Kolooch language.

18. The Atna of Wrangell. — See Baer's Beiträge. Now, another American language, spoken some hundred miles south of the Copper River, of which we find a vocabulary in Sir Alexander Mackenzie's Travels, is called *Atna*. It has no direct affinity with the present tongue. A hypothetical solution of this coincidence lies in the fact, that in the Athabascan languages the root *d-n*, or *t-n* = *man*. That the Kenay call themselves *Tnai*, or *Tnaina* = *men*, is specially stated by Baer, p. 103.

19. The Koltshany vocabulary of Wrangell. — See Baer's Beiträge. The tables of the work in question shew the language to be undoubted Kolooch.

20. The Sitca vocabularies — numerous. Cook's Norfolk Sound; the Sitca of Lisiansky; the Sitca of Davidoff (see Archæologia Americana); the Sitca of Wrangell. According to Captain Bryant, it is spoken from N. lat. 59° to 5° S. by twenty tribes. The number of individuals who speak it reckoned by Mr Green, an American missionary, at 6500 — see Archæologia Americana. The standard Kolooch is that of Sitca or Norfolk Sound.

21. The Tunghaase of Mr Tolmie. Of this, the most southern dialect of Russian America, we find a short vocabulary in the Transactions of the Royal Geographical Society. It is truly stated to be closely allied to the Sitca.

That there are no more than two groups required for the classification of the above-mentioned languages, and that these are the Esquimaux and the Kolooch, seems evident. That these groups are of no high value may be shewn. It is undoubtedly true, that if we only compare isolated vocabularies with each other we shall find little but points of contrast. And we find less than might be expected even when we compare groups of vocabularies.

1. The tables of Baer, exhibiting three languages for the Esquimaux and five for the Kolooch group, give scarcely half a dozen words common to the two.

2. The table of Lisiansky, with the Unalashkan and Cadiack on the one side, and the Kenay and Sitca on the other, presents but little more.

3. The earliest language with which the Ugalyatmutsi was compared were Esquimaux, and the contrast was insisted upon from the first.

It is only when we apply what may be called the *indirect* method that the true value of the Esquimaux group becomes recognised.

1. Each has affinities with the Athabascan tongues, and perhaps equal affinities.

2. Each has affinities with the Oregon languages, and each perhaps equally.

3. Each has definite affinities with the languages of New California, and each perhaps equal ones.

4. Each has miscellaneous affinities with all the other tongues both of North and South America.

These facts that connect the Esquimaux languages with those spoken to the south of them involve, as may be easily seen, a theory of much higher importance than the position of groups like the Kolooch. They are taken along with the geographical position of the Esquimaux race in respect to Asia, and point to the parts in question as the starting-points for the population of the New World. Upon this latter I can only say at present, that I find Esquimaux words in the following languages: —

1. The Koriack.

2. The Kamskadale.

3. The Aino of the Curulian Isles. In respect to this last group, it is remarkable that whilst I only find two words (the names for *house* and *eye*) common to the *Western* Esquimaux vocabularies of Lisiansky and the Aino ones of Langgsdorf, I find between the latter and the *Eastern* Esquimaux of Parry a considerable number.

4. The Corean.

5. The Japanese.

This is in the way of direct evidence. The Oregon and Kolooch languages have similar and equal affinities; whilst the Asiatic languages enumerated have themselves affinities in the Old World known and recognised.

From what has been laid before the Society, it may be seen of how great importance it is to determine, whether the languages of Russian America pass into each other gradually, or are divided by trenchant lines of demarcation.

MISCELLANEOUS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ETHNOGRAPHY OF NORTH AMERICA.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

JANUARY 24, 1845.

The present state of American Ethnography is the excuse for the miscellaneous character of the following notices. What remains just now to be done consists chiefly in the addition of details to an outline already made out. Such communications, however, are mainly intended to serve as isolated points of evidence towards the two following statements: —

1. That no American language has an isolated position when compared with the other tongues *en masse*, rather than with the languages of any particular class.

2. That the affinity between the languages of the New World, as determined by their *vocabularies*, is not less real than that inferred from the analogies of their *grammatical structure*.

Modifications of the current doctrines, as to the value of certain philological groups and classifications, are involved in the positions given above.

The Sitca and Kenay Languages. — That these languages are Esquimaux may be seen by reference to the comparative vocabularies in Lisiansky's Voyages and Baer's Statistische und Ethnographische Nachrichten, &c.

The Ugalyachmutsi. — In the work last quoted this language is shown to be akin to the Kenay. It is termed *Ugalenz*, and is spoken in Russian America, near Mount St. Elias. It has hitherto been too much disconnected from the Esquimaux group.

The Chipewyan and Nagail. — That these were Esquimaux was stated by the author in the Ethnological subsection of

the British Association at York. The Taculli is also Esquimaux. The Sussee, in the present state of our knowledge, is best left without any absolute place. It has several miscellaneous affinities.

The bearing of these notices is to merge the groups called *Athabascan* and *Kolooch* in the Esquimaux.

It has been communicated to the Ethnological Society, that a majority of the languages of Oregon and New Caledonia are akin to each other and to the Esquimaux; a statement applying to about forty-five vocabularies, amongst which are the three following, hitherto considered as isolated: —

1. *The Friendy Village vocabulary of Mackenzie.* See Travels. — This is a dialect of the Billechoola.

2. *The Atna of Mackenzie.* — This is a dialect of the Noosdalum.

3. *The Salish of Duponceau.* See Archæologia Americana. — This is the Okanagan of Mr Tolmie. See Journal of Geographical Society.

The Ahnenin. — In this language, as well as in two others hereafter to be noticed (the Blackfoot and Crow), I have had, through the courtesy of Dr. Prichard, an opportunity of using valuable vocabularies of Gallatin's, collected by Mr Mackenzie, an agent for the American fur-company on the Yellow-stone river; by whom also were drawn up the shorter vocabularies, in Mr. Catlin's work on the American Indians, of the Mandan, Riccaree and other languages. The table also of the Natchez language is chiefly drawn from the comparative catalogues of Mr. Gallatin. That the MS. vocabulary of the Ahnenin represents the language of the Fall Indians of Umfreville, and one different from that of the true Minetares (with which it has been confounded), may be seen from the following comparison.

English.	Fall-Indian of Umfreville.	Ahnenin.	Minetare.
eye	nunnecsoon	araythya	ishtah.
knife	warth	wahata	matzee.
pipe	pechouon	einpssah	eekeepee.
tobacco	cheesouon	kitchtawan	owpai.
dog	hudther	ahttah	matshuga.
fire	usitter	——	beerais.
bow	bart	——	beerahhah.
arrow	utcee	——	eetan.
one	karci	——	lemoisso.
two	neece	nethiyau	noopah.
three	narce	——	namee.
four	nean	yahnayau	topah.

English.	Fall-Indian of Umfreville.	Ahnenin.	Minetare.
five	yautune	——	cheehoh.
six	neteartuce	——	acamai.
seven	nesartuce	——	chappo.
eight	narswartuce	——	nopuppee.
nine	anharbetwartuce	——	nowassappai.
ten	mettartuce	netassa	peeraga.

The Ahnenin language, without being at present referable to any recognized group, has numerous miscellaneous affinities.

English *God.*
Ahnenin esis — *sun.*
Sheshatapoosh shayshoursh.
Passamaquoddy saisos.

English *hair.*
Ahnenin betamnita.
Caddo baat.
Taculli pitsa — *head.*
Uche pseotan — *head.*

English *ear.*
Ahnenin etah.
Esquimaux heutinga.
—— tsheentik.
—— shudik.
Knistenaux otowegu.
Ojibbeway ottowug.
Micmac hadowugan.
Massachusetts wehtoughh.
Narragansets wuttowwog.
Delaware wittauk.
Miami tawakeh.
Shawnoe towakah.
Omohaw neetah.
Osage naughta.
Quappa nottah.

English *nose.*
Ahnenin husi.
Old Algonkin yash.
Massachusetts wutch.

English *mouth.*
Ahnenin ockya.
Osage ehaugh.
Natchez heche.

English *fingers.*
Ahnenin naha.
Onondagos eniage.

English *blood.*
Ahnenin barts.
Caddo baaho.

English *hand.*
Ahnenin ikickan.
Pawnee iksheeree.
Muskoge innkke.
Catawba eeksapeeah.
Mohawk oochsoochta.

English. *leg.*
Ahnenin nunaha.
Sack and Fox nenanah.
Caddo danuna — *foot.*

English *man.*
Ahnenin neehato — *white man.*
—— watamahat — *black? man.*
Tuscarora aineehau.
Nottoway eniha.
Seneca ungouh.
Wyandot aingahon.
Mohawk oonguich.
Dacota weetschahskta.

English *girl.*
Ahnenin wahtah.
Dacota weetsheeahnah.
Yancton weetchinchano.

Yancton	weetachnong — *daughter.*
Osage	wetongah — *sister.*
English	*wife.*
Ahnenin	etha.
Kenay	ssióo.
English	*water.*
Ahnenin	nitsa.
Quappa	nih.
Uche	tsach.
English	*sun.*
Ahnenin	esis.
Algonkin	kesis.
Choctaw	hashe.
Ohikkasaw	husha.
Muskoge	hahsie.
English	*rock.*
Ahnenin	hannike.
Winebago	eenee.
Dacota	eeang.
Yancton	eeyong.
Mohawk	oonoyah.
Onondago	onaja.
English	*wood.*
Ahnenin	bess.
Passamaquoddy	apass — *tree.*
Abenaki	abassi — *tree.*
English	*bear.*
Ahnenin	wussa.
Quappa	wassah.
Osage	wasauba.
Omahaw	wassabai.
English	*dog.*
Ahnenin	ahttah.
——	hudther.
Sheshatapoosh	attung.
Abenaki	attie.
Tuscarora	tcheer,
Nottoway	cheer.
English	*elk.*
Ahnenin	wussea.
Miami	musuoh — *deer.*
Illinois	mousoah—*deer.*
English	*bad.*
Ahnenin	wahnatta.
Mohawk	wahpateku.
Onondagos	wahethe.
Oneida	wahetka.
English	*good.*
Ahnenin	etah.
Caddo	hahut — *handsome.*
English	*me, mine.*
Ahnenin	nistow.
Blackfoot	niste — *I.*
English	*you.*
Ahnenin	ahnan.
Kenay	nan.
English	*to-day.*
Ahnenin	wananaki.
Mohawk	kuhhwanteh.
Onondagos	neucke.
English	*to-morrow.*
Ahnenin	nacah.
Tchuktchi	unako.
——	unniok.
Choctaw	onaha.
English	*many.*
Ahnenin	ukaka.
Mohawk	awquayakoo.
Seneca	kawkuago.
English	*drink.*
Ahnenin	nahbin.
Osage	nebnatoh.
English	*sleep.*
Ahnenin	nuckcoots.
Abenaki	nekasi.
Mohawk	yihkootos.
Onondagos	agotawi.
Seneca	wanuhgoteh.
English	*two.*
Ahnenin	neece.
Passamaquoddy	nes.

Abenaki	niss.
Massachusetts	neese.
Narragansets	neesse.
Mohican	neesoh.
Montaug	nees.
——	neeze.
Adaize	nass.
English	*three.*
Ahnenin	narce.
Abenaki	nash.
Narragansets	nish.
English	*four.*
Ahnenin	nean.
——	yahnayau.
Ojibbeway	newin.
Ottawa	niwin.
Knistenaux	nayo.
Old Algonkin	neyoo.
Sheshatapoosh	naou.
Massachusetts	yaw.
Narragansets	yoh.
English	*six.*
Ahnenin	nekitukujan.
Knistenaux	negotoahsik.
Ojibbeway	gotoasso.
——	nigouta waswois.
Ottawa	ningotowaswi.
Abenaki	negudaus.
Montaug	nacuttah.

The Blackfoot. — Of this language we have three vocabularies; a short one by Umfreville, a short one in Mr. Catlin's work, and the longer and more important one in Mr. Gallatin's manuscripts. The three vocabularies represent the same language. Its affinities are miscellaneous; more however with the Algonkin tongues than with those of the other recognized groups.

English	*woman.*
Blackfoot	ahkeya.
Old Algonkin	ickweh.
Ottawa	uque.
Delaware	okhqueh.
——	khqeu.
Nanticoke	acquahique.
Illinois	ickoe.
Shawnoe	equiwa.
Sauki	kwoyikih.
Cherokee	ageyung.
Woccoon	yecauau.
English	*boy.*
Blackfoot	sacoomahpa.
Upsaroka	skakkatte.
English.	*girl.*
Blackfoot	ahkaquoin.
Catawba	yahwachahu.
English	*child.*
Blackfoot	pokah.
Upsaroka	bakkatte.
English	*father.*
Blackfoot	onwa.
Seneca	hanee.
English	*husband.*
Blackfoot	ohmah.
Esquimaux	oemah.
English	*daughter.*
Blackfoot	netan.
Knistenaux	netannis.
Ojibbeway	nindanis.
——	nedannis.
Ottawa	tanis.
Massachusetts	nutannis.
Narragansets	nittannis.
Illinois	tahana.
Sack and Fox	tanes.
Uche	teyunung.
English	*brother.*
Blackfoot	nausah.
Passamaquoddy	nesiwas.
Abenaki	nitsie.

English	*head.*
Blackfoot	otoquoin.
Old Algonkin	oostiquan.
Sheshatapoosh	stoukoan.
Ojibbeway	oostegwon.
Knistenaux	istegwen.
——	ustequoin.

English	*nose.*
Blackfoot	okissis.
Menomeni	oocheeush.

English	*neck.*
Blackfoot	ohkokin.
Miami	kwaikaneh.
Sack and Fox	nekwaikaneh.

English	*hand.*
Blackfoot	okittakis.
Esquimaux	iyuteeka.
——	tikkiek—*fingers.*

English	*leg.*
Blackfoot	ohcat.
Ojibbeway	okat.
Knistenaux	miskate.
Sheshatapoosh	neescatch.
Massachusetts	muhkout.
Menomeni	oakauut.

English	*feet.*
Blackfoot	oaksakah.
Wyandot	ochsheetau.
Mohawk	oochsheeta.
Onondago	ochsita.
Seneca	oochsheeta.
Oneyda	ochsheecht.
Nottoway	seeke — *toes.*

English	*bone.*
Blackfoot	ohkinnah.
Knistenaux	oskann.
Ojibbeway	okun.
Ottawa	okunnum.
Miami	kanih.
Massachusetts	uskon.
Narragansets	wuskan.
Shawnoe	ochcunne.
Sack and Fox	okaneh.
Menomeni	okunum.

English	*kettle.*
Blackfoot	eske.
Knistenaux	askick.
Ojibbeway	akkeek.

English	*shoes.*
Blackfoot	atsakin.
Mohawk	ohtaquah.
Seneca	auhtoyuawo-hya.
Nottoway	otawgwag.

English	*bread.*
Blackfoot	ksaquonats.
Mohican	tauquauh.
Shawnoe	taquanah.

English	*spring.*
Blackfoot	motoe.
Osage	paton.

English	*summer.*
Blackfoot	napoos.
Knistenaux	nepin.
Ojibbeway	neebin.
——	nipin.
Ottawa	nipin.
Sheshatapoosh	neepun.
Micmac	nipk.
Abenaki	nipéné.
Massachusetts	nepun.
Narragansets	neepun.
Mohican	nepoon.
Delaware	nipen.
Miami	nipeenueh.
Shawnoe	nepeneh.
Sack and Fox	neepenweh.
Menomeni	neeaypeenay-waywah.

English	*hail.*
Blackfoot	sahco.
Knistenaux	sasagun.
Ojibbeway	sasaigan.
Sheshatapoosh	shashaygan.

English	*fire.*
Blackfoot	esteu.
Mohican	stauw.

English *water.*
Blackfoot ohhkeah.
Chikkasaw uckah.
Attacapa ak.

English *ice.*
Blackfoot sacoocootah.
Esquimaux sikkoo.
Tchuktchi tshikuta.

English *earth.*
Blackfoot ksahcoom.
Knistenaux askee.
Ojibbeway ahkee.
Ottawa aki.
Old Algonkin ackey.
—— ackwin.

English *lake.*
Blackfoot omah sekame.
Knistenaux sakiegun.
Ojibbeway sahgiegun.
Shawnoe mskaque.

English *island.*
Blackfoot mane.
Upsaroka minne — *water.*
—— minneteekah — *lake.*
—— minnepeshu — *island.*
Knistenaux ministick.
Ojibbeway minnis.
Old Algonkin minis.
Passamaquoddy muniqu.
Abenaki menahan.
Mohican mnauhan.
Delaware menokhtey.
—— menatey.
Miami menahanweh.
Menomeni meenayish.

English *rock, stone.*
Blackfoot ohcootoke.
Nottoway ohhoutahk.

English *tree.*
Blackfoot masetis.
Ojibbeway metik.
Old Algonkin metiih.
Sheshatapoosh mistookooah.
Massachusetts mehtug.

English *grass.*
Blackfoot mahtooyaase.
Miami metahkotuck.
Quappa montih.

English *leaf.*
Blackfoot soyapoko.
Massachusetts wunnepog.
Narragansets wunnepog.
Mohican wunnepok.
Miami metshipakwa.
Sack and Fox tatapacoan.
Menomeni ahneepeeoakunah.

English *beaver.*
Blackfoot kakestake.
Esquimaux keeyeeak.

English. *wolf.*
Blackfoot mahcooya.
Esquimaux amaok.
Knistenaux myegun.
Ojibbeway mieengun.
—— maygan.
Old Algonkin mahingan.
Massachusetts muckquoshin.
Narragansets muckquashin.
Miami muhkwaiauch.

English *bird.*
Blackfoot pakesa.
Massachusetts psukses.
Narragansets peasis.

English *egg.*
Blackfoot ohwas.
Taculli ogaze.
Kenay kquasa.
Cherokee oowatse.
Salish ooseh.

English *goose.*
Blackfoot emahkiya.
Menomeni mckawk.

English *partridge.*
Blackfoot katokin.
Nanticoke kitteawndip-qua.

English *red.*
Blackfoot mohisenum.
Massachusetts misqueh.

English *yellow.*
Blackfoot ohtahko.
Esquimaux toongook.
—— tshongak.
Knistenaux asawwow.
Ojibbeway ozawa.
—— ojawa.
Old Algonkin oozao.
Sack and Fox ossawah.
Menomeni oashahweeyah.

English *great.*
Blackfoot ohmohcoo.
Micmac mechkilk.
Mohican makauk.

English *small.*
Blackfoot enahcootse.
Upsaroka ecat.

English *strong.*
Blackfoot miskappe.
Knistenaux mascawa.
Ojibbeway machecawa.
Old Algonkin masshkawa.
Nanticoke miskiu.

English *warm.*
Blackfoot kazetotzu.
Knistenaux kichatai.
—— kisopayo.
Ojibbeway kezhoyah.
Ottawa keshautta.
Old Algonkin akishattey.
Passamaquoddy kesipetai.
Massachusetts kussutan.
Narragansets kssetauwou.

English *I.*
Blackfoot nisto.
Chipewyan ne.
Knistenaux nitha.
—— neya.
Ojibbeway neen, nin.
Old Algonkin nir.
Sheshatapoosh neele.
Micmac nil.
Illinois nira.
Ahnenin nistow.

English *thou.*
Blackfoot christo.
Knistenaux kitha.
Ojibbeway keen, kin.
Old Algonkin kir.
Micmac kil.
Illinois kira.

English *this, that.*
Blackfoot kanakha.
Upsaroka kinna.
Nanticoke youkanna.

English *to-day.*
Blackfoot anookchusi-quoix.
Knistenaux anoutch.
Onondago neuchke.

English *yesterday.*
Blackfoot mahtone.
Dacota tanneehah.

English *drink.*
Blackfoot semate.
Upsaroka smimmik.

English *speak.*
Blackfoot apooyatz.
Upsaroka bidow.

English *sing.*
Blackfoot anihkit.
Knistenaux necummoon.
Ojibbeway nugamoo.
Sheshatapoosh nekahmoo.
Illinois nacamohok.
Menomeni neckaumee-noon.

English *sleep.*
Blackfoot okat.

Mohawk	yihkootos.	English	*kill.*
Onondago	agotawi.	*Blackfoot*	enikke.
Seneca	wanuhgoteh.	*Abenaki*	nenirke.

The Blackfoot numerals, as given by Mackenzie and Umfreville, slightly differ. The termination in *-um* runs through the numerals of Fitz-Hugh Sound, an Oregon language.

English.	Blackfoot of Umfreville.	Blackfoot of Mackenzie.	Fitz-Hugh Sound.
one	tokescum	sa	nimscum.
two	nartokescum	nahtoka	malscum
three	nohokescum	nahhoka	utascum.
four	nesweum	nasowe	moozcum.
five	nesittwi	nesitto	thikaescum.
six	nay	nowwe	kitliscum.
seven	kitsic	akitsecum	atloopooscum.
eight	narnesweum	nahnissowe	malknaskum.
nine	picksee	pakeso	nanooskim.
ten	keepey	kepo	highio.

2. nekty, *Tuscarora*; tiknee, *Seneca;* teghia, *Oneida;* dekanee, *Nottoway;* tekini, *Otto.*

3. noghoh, *Mohican;* nakha, *Delaware.*

5. nthsysta, *Mohawk;* sattou, *Quappa;* satta, *Osage*, *Omahaw;* sata, *Otto;* sahtsha, *Minetare.*

7. tzauks, *Kawitchen, Noosdalum.*

10. kippio, *Chimmesyan.*

The Crow and Mandan Languages. — Of the important language of the Upsarokas or Crows the Archæologia Americana contains only thirty words. Of the Mandan we have, in the same work, nothing beyond the names of ten chiefs. In Gallatin's classification these tribes are dealt with as subdivisions of the Minetare nation. Now the Minetare are of the Sioux or Dacota family.

Between the Mandan vocabulary of Mr. Catlin and the Crow vocabulary of Gallatin's MSS. there are the following words in common. The affinity seems less close than it is generally stated to be: still the two languages appear to be Sioux. This latter point may be seen in the second table.

English.	mandan.	Crow.
God	mahhopeneta	sakahbooatta.
sun	menakha	a'hhhiza.
moon	esto menakha	minnatatche.
stars	h'kaka	ekieu.
rain	h'kahoost	hannah.

English.	Mandan.	Crow.
snow	copcaze	makkoupah — *hail.*
river	passahah	ahesu.
day	hampah	maupah.
night	estogr	oche.
dark	hampaheriskah	chippusheka.
light	edayhush	thieshe.
woman	meha	meyakatte.
wife	moorse	moah.
child	sookhomaha	bakkatte.
girl	sookmeha	meyakatte.
boy	sooknumohk	shakkatte.
head	pan	marshaa.
legs	doka	buchoope.
eyes	estume	meishta.
mouth	ea	ea.
nose	pahoo	buppa.
face	estah	esa.
ears	nakoha	uppa.
hand	onka	buschie.
fingers	onkaha	buschie.
foot	shee	busche.
hair	hahhee	masheah.
canoe	menanko	maheshe.
fish	poh	booah.
bear	mahto	duhpitsa.
wolf	haratta	chata.
dog	mones waroota	biska.
buffalo	ptemday	bisha.
elk	omepah	eitchericazzse.
deer	mahmanacoo	ohha.
beaver	warrappa	biruppe.
shoe	hoompah	hoompe.
bow	warraenoopah	bistuheeah.
arrow	mahha	ahnailz.
pipe	ehudka	ompsa.
tobacco	mannasha	hopa.
good	shushu	itsicka.
bad	k'hecush	kubbeek.
hot	dsasosh	ahre.
cold	shineehush	hootshere.
I	me	be.
thou	ne	de.
he	e	na.
we	noo	bero.
they	eonah	mihah.

English.	Mandan.	Crow.
1	mahhannah	amutcat.
2	nompah	noomcat.
3	namary	namenacat.
4	tohha	shopecat.
5	kakhoo	chihhocat.
6	kemah	ahcamacat.
7	koopah	sappoah.
8	tatucka	noompape.
9	mahpa	ahmuttappe.
10	perug	perakuk.

English	*God.*
Mandan	mahhoppeneta.
Winebago	mahahnah.
Minetare	manhopa.
Algonkin	marutoo.
English	*sun.*
Mandan	menahka.
Omahaw	meencajai.
Caddo	manoh — *light.*
English	*star.*
Mandan	h'kaka.
Quappa	mihcacheh.
Otto	peekahhai.
Omahaw	meecaai.
Minetare	eekah.
English	*day.*
Mandan	hampah eriskah.
Winebago	haunip.
——	haumpeehah.
Dacota	anipa.
Yancton	aungpa.
Osage	hompaye.
Otto	hangwai.
Omahaw	ombah.
Minetare	mahpaih.
English	*woman.*
Mandan	meha.
Yancton	weeah.
Omahaw	waoo.
Minetare	meeyai.
Ioway	mega.
English	*child.*
Mandan	sookhomaha.
Quappa	schehjinka.
Otto	cheechingai.
Omahâw	shingashinga.
English	*head.*
Mandan	pan.
Dacota	pah.
Yancton	pah.
Quappa	pahhih.
Omahaw	pah.
English	*arms.*
Mandan	arda.
Minetare	arrough.
Pawnee	heeeeru.
English	*leg.*
Mandan	doka.
Quappa	jaccah.
Osage	sagaugh.
English	*eyes.*
Mandan	estume.
Dacota	ishta.
Yancton	ishtah.
Quappa	inschta.
Otto &c.	ishta.
English	*mouth.*
Mandan	ea.
Sioux passim	ea.
English	*nose.*
Mandan	pahoo.
Sioux passim	pah.
English	*face.*
Mandan	estah.
Dacota	eetai.

Yancton	eetai.
Minetare	etah.
English	*ears.*
Mandan	nakoha.
Winebago	nahchahwah-hah.
Yancton	nougkopa.
Osage	naughta.
English	*hands.*
Mandan	onka.
Nottoway	nunke.
Tuscarora	ohehneh.
Menomeni	oanah.
Miami	enahkee.
English	*fingers.*
Mandan	onkahah.
Onondago	eniage.
Wyandot	eyingia.
Tchuktchi	ainhanka.
English	*foot,*
Mandan	shee.
Sioux	sih.
Pawnee	ashoo.
Tuscarora	uhseh.
English	*hair.*
Mandan	pahhee.
Sioux	pahee.
English	*fish.*
Mandan	poh.
Minetare	boa.
Sioux	ho, hough.
English	*beaver.*
Mandan	warappah.
Minetare	meerapa.
Otto	rawaiy.
English	*deer.*
Mandan	mahmanaco.
Yancton	tamindoca.
English	*house.*
Mandan	ote.
Ioway	tshe.
English	*bow.*
Mandan	warraenoopah.
Minetare	beerahhah.
Tuscarora	awraw.
English	*arrow.*
Mandan	mahha.
Sioux	mong, ma.
English	*shoe.*
Mandan	hoompah.
Dacota	hanipa.
Quappa	honpeh.
Minetare	opah.
English	*bad.*
Mandan	k'heeush.
Dacota	sheecha.
English	*cold.*
Mandan	shineekush.
Winebago	seeneehee.
Sioux	snee.
English	*no.*
Mandan	megosh.
Tuscarora	gwush.
English	*I.*
Mandan	me.
Dacota	meeah.
Minetare	meeee.
Quappa	vieh.
Osage	veca.
English	*thou.*
Mandan	ne.
Winebago	ney.
Dacota	neeah.
Minetare	nehe.
English	*he.*
Mandan	e.
Dacota	eeah.
English	*we.*
Mandan	noo.
Winebago.	neehwahkia-weeno.
Onondago	ni.
Knistenaux	neou.

English	*one.*
Mandan	mahhannah.
Osage	minche.
Omahaw	meeachchee.
English	*two.*
Mandan	nompah.
Sioux	nompa, noopa.
Uche	nowah.
English	*three.*
Mandan	namary.
Minetare	namee.
English	*four.*
Mandan	tohha.
Sioux	topah, tuah.
English	*five.*
Mandan	kakhoo.
Minetare	cheehoh.
Muskoge	chahgkie.
English	*six.*
Mandan	kemah.
Minetare	acamai.
English	*seven.*
Mandan	koopah.
Minetare	chappo.
English	*eight.*
Mandan	tatucka.
Seneca	tikkeugh.
Mohawk	sohtayhhko.
English	*ten.*
Mandan	perug.
Minetare	peragas.

The Riccaree Language. — In Balbi and in the Mithridates, the Riccaree is stated to be a dialect of the Pawnee; but no words are given of it: hence the evidence is inconclusive. Again, the term Pawnee is equivocal. There are tribes called Pawnees on the river Platte, and tribes called Pawnees on the Red river of Texas. Of the last nation we have no vocabulary; they appear however to be different from the first, and are Pawnees *falsely so called.*

Of the Riccaree we have but one vocabulary (Catlin's North American Indians, vol. ii.); it has the following words common with the *true* Pawnee list of Say in the Archæologia Americana, vol. ii.

English.	Pawnee.	Ricaree.
God	thouwahat	tewaroohteh.
devil	tsaheekshkakooraiwah	kakewaroohteh.
sun	shakoroo	shakoona.
fire	tateetoo	tekieeht.
moon	pa	wetah.
stars	opeereet	saca.
rain	tatsooroo	tassou.
snow	toosha	tahhau.
day	shakoorooeeshairet	shacona.
night	eeraishnaitee	eenahgt.
light	shusheegat	shakoonah.
dark	eeraishuaite	tekatistat.
hot	toueetstoo	towarist.
cold	taipeechee	teepse.

English.	Pawnee.	Ricaree.
yes	nawa	neecoola.
no	kakee	kaka.
bear	koorooksh	keahya.
dog	ashakish	hohtch.
bow	teeragish	nache.
arrow	leekshoo	neeche.
hut	akkaroo	acare.
woman	tsapat	sapat.
boy	peeshkee	weenatch.
girl	tchoraksh	soonahtch.
child	peeron	pera.
head	pakshu	pahgh.
ears	atkaroo	tickokite.
eyes	keercekoo	cheereecoo.
hair	oshu	pahi.
hand	iksheeree	tehonare.
fingers	haspeet	parick.
foot	ashoo	ahgh.
canoe	lakohoroo	lahkeehoon.
river	kattoosh	sahonnee.
I	ta	nanto.
1	askoo	asco.
2	peetkoo	pitco.
3	touweet	towwit.
4	shkeetish	tcheetish.
5	sheeooksh	tcheetishoo.
6	sheekshabish	tcheetishpis.
7	peetkoosheeshabish	totchapis.
8	touweetshabish	tochapiswon.
9	looksheereewa	totchapisnahhenewon.
10	looksheeree	nahen.
20	petouoo	wetah.
30	luksheereewetouoo	sahwee.
100	sheekookshtaroo	shontan.

The special affinities of the Riccaree are not very decided. It is anything rather than an isolated language; and will, probably, be definitely placed when we obtain vocabularies of the Indian languages of Texas.

English	*evil spirit.*	*Caddo*	sako.
Riccaree	kakewaroohteh.	*Salish*	skokoleel.
Catawba	yahwerejeh.	*Delaware*	gishukh.
		Mohican	kesogh.
English	*sun.*	*Esquimaux*	sukkenuk.
Riccaree	shakoona.	*Tchuktchi*	shekenak.

English *stars.*
Riccaree saca.
Caddo tsokas.

English *night.*
Riccaree enaght.
Esquimaux oonooak.
—— unjuk.
Massachusetts nukon.

English *dark*
Riccaree tekatistat.
Attacapa tegg — *night.*
Natchez toowa — *night.*
Mohawk tewhgarlars.
Oneida tetincalas.

English *snow.*
Riccaree tahhau.
Adaize towat.
Natchez kowa.
Uche stahae.

English *fire.*
Riccaree tekieeht.
Onondagos yotecka.
Ioway tako.
Ugalenz takgak.
Kenay taze.

English *cold.*
Riccaree teepse.
Attacapa tsamps.

English *bad*
Riccaree kah.
Mandan k'hecush.
Sioux sheecha.

English *boy.*
Riccaree weenatch.
Nottoway aqueianha.
Esquimaux einyook.
Winebago eeneek — *son.*
Oneida yungh.

English *head, hair.*
Riccaree pahgh, pahi.
Sioux pah, pan.
Massachusetts puhkuk.

Choctaw eebuk.
Chiccasaw skoboch.

English *eye.*
Riccaree cheereeco.
Tuscarora ookawreh.
Esquimaux eerruka.

English *foot.*
Riccaree ahgh.
Choctaw iya.
Chiccasaw eaya.

English *arms.*
Riccaree arrai.
Mandan arda.
Tuscarora orungjai.

English *bear.*
Riccaree keahya.
Seneca yucwy.
Tchuktchi kainga.

English *shoes.*
Riccaree hooche
Sioux hongha.

English *arrow.*
Riccaree neeche.
Choctaw oski noki.
Chiccasaw nucka.

English *hut.*
Riccaree acane.
Mohawk canuchsha.
Onondago ganschsaje.
Oneida kaunoughsau.
Tuscarora yaukuhnugh.

English *canoe.*
Riccaree lahkeehoon.
Taculli allachee.
Salish 'tlea'yh.

English *yes.*
Riccaree neecoola.
Adaize cola.

English *no.*
Riccaree kaka.
Chetimacha kahie.

Algonkin	kah.	*Onondayo*	skata.
Kenay	kukol.	*Seneca*	skaut.
English	*I.*	English	*two.*
Riccaree	nanto.	*Riccaree*	pitco.
Algonkin	neen.	*Caddo*	behit.
English	*you.*	English	*four.*
Riccaree	kaghon.	*Riccaree*	tcheetish.
Algonkin	keen.	*Attacapa*	tsets.
English	*one.*	English	*thirty.*
Riccaree	asco.	*Riccaree*	sahwee.
Wyandot	scat.	*Cherokee*	tsawaskaw.
Mohawk	huskat.		

The Creek and Choctaw Languages. — That the question as to the affinity between the Creek and the Choctaw languages is a question of classification rather than of fact, may be seen from the Archæologia Americana, vol. ii. p. 405; where it is shown that out of six hundred words, ninety-seven are common to the two languages.

The Caddo. — That this language has affinities with the Mohawk, Seneca, and the Iroquois tongues in general, and that it has words common to the Muskoge, the Catawba, the Pawnee, and the Cherokee languages may be seen from the tables of the Archæologia Americana. The illustrations however of these languages are to be drawn from a knowledge of the dialects of Texas and the Oregon districts, tracts of country whereon our information is preeminently insufficient.

The Natchez. — This language has the following miscellaneous affinities, insufficient to give it a place in any definite group, but sufficient to show that it is anything rather than an isolated language.

English	*man.*	English	*girl.*
Natchez	tomkuhpena.	*Natchez*	hohlenoo.
Cochimi	tamma.	*Noosdalum*	islanie.
St. Xavier	tamma.	*Squallyamish*	islanie.
Loretto	tamma.	*Kawitchen*	islanie.
St. Borgia	tama.	English	*head.*
Othomi	dame.	*Natchez*	tomme apoo.
Shahaptan	hama.	*Dacota*	pah.
English	*woman.*	*Yancton*	pah.
Natchez	tamahl.	*Quappa*	pahih.
Huasteca	tomol.	*Omahaw*	pah.

English *hair*
Natchez etene.
Mixteca dzini.

English *eye.*
Natchez oktool.
Mexican ikhtelolotli.

English *nose.*
Natchez shamats.
Huasteca zam.

English *mouth*
Natchez heche.
Poconchi chi.
Maya chi.

English *tooth*
Natchez int.
Calapooiah tinti.
Mexican tentli — *lip.*
Cora tenita.

English *moon.*
Natchez kwasip.
St. Antonio tatsoopai.
Kawitchen quassin — *stars.*
Noosdalum quassin — *stars.*

English *star.*
Natchez tookul.
St. Antonio tatchhuanilh.
Cathlascou tukycha na-
Caddo pucha.
tsokas.

English *river.*
Natchez wol.
Pima vo — *lake.*
Cathlascou emalh.

English *hill.*
Natchez kweyakoopsel.
St. Juan Capistrano kahui.
Kliketat keh.
Dacota khyaykah.
Yancton haiaca.

English *maize.*
Natchez hokko.
Adaize ocasuck.

English *tree.*
Natchez tshoo.
Choctaw itte.
Chikkasaw itta.
Muskoge ittah.

English *flesh.*
Natchez wintse.
Algonkin wioss.

English *deer.*
Natchez tza.
Winebago tcha.
Quappa tah.
Muskoge itzo.
Caddo dah.

English *buffalo.*
Natchez wastanem.
Uche wetenenvuene-
kah.

English *fish.*
Natchez henn.
Chimmesyan hone kustamo-
ane — *salmon.*
Kliketat tkinnat.
Shahaptan tkinnat.
Mohawk keyunk.
Seneca kenyuck.
Oneida kunjoon.
Nottoway kaintu.
Yancton hohung.

English *white.*
Natchez hahap.
Shahaptan hipi.
Attacapa cobb.
Old Angonkin wabi.
Delaware wape.
Shawnoe opee.

English *black.*
Natchez tsokokop.
Narragansets suckesu.
Long Island shickayo.

English *bad.*
Natchez wattaks.
Mohawk wahhatekuh.

Onondago wahethe.
Oneida wahetka.

English *cold.*
Natchez tzitakopana.
Kliketat tsoisah.
Shahaptan tsoisah.

English *hot.*
Natchez wahiloohie.
Muskoge hahiye.
Attacapa alliu.

English *I.*
Natchez tukehah.
Adaize hicatuck.
Chetimacha uticheca.

English *thou.*
Natchez ukkehah.
Kliketat yuke.

English *arm.*
Natchez ish.
Dacota ishto.
Yancton isto.

English *blood.*
Natchez itsh.
Choctaw issish.
Chikkasaw issish.

English *town.*
Natchez walt.
Pawnee kwat.

English *house,*
Natchez hahit.
Dacota tea.
Yancton teepee.
Quappa tih.
Osage tiah.
Omahaw tee.
Minetare attee.

English *friend.*
Natchez ketanesuh—*my.*
Chetimacha keta.

English *boat.*
Natchez kwagtolt.
Chimmesyan waigh — *paddle.*
Caddo haugh.

English *sky.*
Natchez nasookta.
Chimmesyan suchah.
Tlaoquatch naase.
Muskoge sootah.
Choctaw shutik.

English *sun.*
Natchez wah.
Noosdalum kokweh.
Squallyamish thlokwahl.
Poconchi quih.
Yancton oouee.

English *night.*
Natchez toowa.
Chetimacha timan.
Attacapa tegg.

English *summer.*
Natchez amehika.
Billechoola awmilk.

English *winter.*
Natchez kwishitsheta-kop.
Mohawk koosilkhuhhug-gheh.
Oneida koashlakke.
Tuscarora. koosehhea.
Nottoway goshera.

English *thunder.*
Natchez pooloopooloo-lunluh.
Chimmesyan killapilleip.

English *snow.*
Natchez kowa.
Billechoola kai.

English *sea.*
Natchez kootshel.
St. Diego khasilk.
Choctaw okhuttah.

English *bear.*
Natchez tsokohp.
Uche ptsaka.

English	*snake.*	English	*run.*
Natchez	wollah.	*Natchez*	kwalneskook.
Esquimaux	malligooak.	*Shahaptan*	willnikit.
English	*bird.*	English	*kill.*
Natchez	shankolt.	*Natchez*	appawe.
Uchee	psenna.	*Choctaw*	uhbe.
Tuscarora	tshenu.		
English	*eat.*	English	*walk.*
Natchez	kimposko.	*Natchez*	naktik.
Muskoge	humbiischa.	*Adaize.*	enacoot.

The Uche, *Adaize*, &c. — See Archæologia Americana, vol. ii. p. 306. For these languages, tables similar to those of the Natchez have been drawn up, which indicate similar affinities. The same can be done for the Chetimacha and Attacapa.

New Californian Languages. — The dialects of this district form no exception to the statements as to the unity of the American languages. In the Journal of the Geographical Society (part 2. vol. ii.) we find seven vocabularies for these parts. Between the language of the diocese of San Juan Capistrano and that of San Gabriel, the affinity is palpable, and traces of a regular letter change are exhibited, viz. from *l* to r:

English.	San Juan Capistrano.	San Gabriel
moon	mioil	muarr.
water	pal	paara.
salt	engel	ungurr.

Between the remaining vocabularies, the resemblance by no means lies on the surface; still it is unquestionable. To these *data* for New California may be added the Severnow and Bodega vocabularies in Baer's *Beiträge* &c. These two last, to carry our comparison no further, have, amongst others, the following terms in common with the Esquimaux tongues:

English	*white.*	English	*beard.*
Severnow	kalle.	*Bodega*	ymmy.
Esquimaux	kowdlook, kowlook.	*Esquimaux*	oomich.
		English	*sky.*
English	*hand.*	*Severnow*	kalu.
Bodega	talu.	*Cadeack*	kilik.
Esquimaux	tadleek, dallek — *arm.*	English	*moon.*
		Severnow	kalazha.
		Kenay	golshagi.

English	*water.*	English	*night.*
Severnow	aka.	*Bodega*	kayl.
Bodega	duka.	*Ugalyachmutsc*	khatl.
Ugalyachmutsc	kai.	English	*star.*
English	*ice.*	*Severnow*	karnau.
Severnow	tulash.	*Greenland*	kaumeh—*moon.*
Ugalyachmutsc	thlesh.	English	*head.*
Bodega	kulla.	*St. Barbara*	nucchu.
Fox Island.	klakh.	*Greenland*	niackoa.
English	*day.*	English	*winter.*
Severnow	madzhu.	*Severnow*	komua.
Cadeack	matsiak — *sun.*	*Tchuktchi*	ukiumi.

The concluding notices are upon languages which have already been placed, but concerning which fresh evidence is neither superfluous nor misplaced.

Sacks and Foxes. — Cumulative to evidence already current as to the tribes of the Sacks and Foxes belonging to the Algonkin stock, it may be stated that a few words collected by the author from the Sack chief lately in London were Algonkin.

The Ojibbeways. — A fuller vocabulary, taken from the mouth of the interpreters of the Ojibbeway Indians lately exhibited, identifies their language with that represented by the vocabularies of Long, Carver, and Mackenzie.

The Ioway. — Of the Ioway Indians, Mr. Gallatin, in 1836, writes as follows: — "They are said, *though the fact is not "fully ascertained*, to speak the same dialect," *i. e.* with the Ottoes. Again, he writes, "We have not that [the voca- "bulary] of the Ioways, but nineteen words supplied by Go- "vernor Cass seem to leave no doubt of its identity with the "Ottoes." — *Archæolog. Amer.* ii. 127, 128. Cass's vocabulary is printed in p. 377.

In 1843, however, a book was published in the Ioway language, bearing the following title page, "An Elementary "Book of the Ioway Language, with an English Translation, "by Wm. Hamilton and S. M. Irvine, under the direction "of the B. F. Miss; of the Presbyterian Church: J. B Roy, "Interpreter; Ioway and Sac Mission Press, Indian Territory, 1843." In this book the orthographical principles are by no means unexceptionable; they have the merit however of expressing simple single sounds by simple single letters; thus *v* = the *a* in *fall; x* = the *u* in *tub; c* = the *ch* in *chest; f* = *th; g* = *ng; j* = *sh. Q* however is preserved as a double sound = *qu.* From this alphabet it is inferred that the Io-

way language possesses the rare sound of the English *th*. With the work in question I was favoured by Mr. Catlin.

Now it is only necessary to pick out from this little work the words selected by Balbi in his Atlas Ethnographique, and to compare them with the corresponding terms as given by the same author for the Sioux, the Winebago, the Otto, the Konza, the Omahaw, the Minetare, and the Osage languages, to be convinced the Ioway language belongs to the same class, coinciding more especially with the Otto.

English	*head.*
Ioway	nanthu.
Winebago	nahsso.
Otto	naso.
Minetare	antu.

English	*nose.*
Ioway	pa.
Sioux	paso.
Winebago	pah.
Otto	peso.
Konza	pah.
Omahaw	pah.
Minetare	apah.
Sioux	pah — *head.*
Omahaw	pah — *head.*

English	*mouth.*
Ioway	e.
Sioux	ei.
Winebago	i.
Otto	i.
Konza	yih, ih.
Minetare	iiiptshappah.
Omahaw	ihah.
Osage	ehaugh.

English	*hand.*
Ioway	nawæ.
Sioux	nape.
Winebago	nahpön.
Otto	naue.
Omahaw	nombe.
Osage	nomba.

English	*feet.*
Ioway	the.
Sioux	siha.
Winebago	si.
Otto	si.
Konza	sih.
Omahaw	si.
Minetare	itsi.
Osage	see.

English	*tongue.*
Ioway	ræthæ.
Otto	reze.
Sioux	tshedzhi.
Konza	yeezah.
Minetare	theysi.

English	*teeth.*
Ioway	he.
Sioux	hi.
Winebago	hi.
Otto	hi.
Konza	hih.
Omahaw	ei.
Minetare	ii.

English	*fire.*
Ioway	pæchæ.
Sioux	peta.
Winebago	pytshi.
Otto	pede.
Omahaw	pede.
Osage	pajah.

English	*water.*
Ioway	ne.
Sioux	mini.
Winebago	ninah, nih.
Otto	ni.
Omakaw	ni.
Minetare	mini.
Osage	neah.

English	*one.*
Ioway	eyungkæ.
Otto	yonke.
Sioux	wonchaw.
——	ouonnchaou.

English	*two.*
Ioway	nowæ.
Sioux	nopa.
——	nonpa.
Winebago	nopi.
Otto	noue.
Konza	nompah.
Minetare	noopah.
Osage	nombaugh.

English	*three.*
Ioway	tanye.
Winebago	tahni.
Otto	tana.

English	*four.*
Ioway	towæ.
Sioux	topah.
Winebago	tshopi.
Otto	toua.
Konza	tohpah.
Omahaw	toba.
Minetare	topah.
Osage	tobah.

English	*five.*
Ioway	thata.
Sioux	zapta.
Winebago	satsch.
Otto	sata.
Konza	sahtah.
Omahaw	satta.
Osage	sattah.

English	*six.*
Ioway	shaqæ.
Sioux	shakpe.
Winebago	kohui.
Otto	shaque.
Konaz	shappeh.
Omahaw	shappe.
Osage	shappah.

English	*seven.*
Ioway	shahma.
Otto	shaḥemo.
Minetare	tshappo.

English	*eight.*
Ioway	krærapane.
Otto	krærabene.
Omahaw	perabini.

English	*nine.*
Ioway	ksangkæ.
Otto	shanke.
Konza	shankkoh.
Omahaw	shonka.
Osage	shankah.

English	*ten.*
Ioway	kræpana.
Winebago	kherapon.
Otto	krebenoh.
Konza	kerebrah.
Omahaw	krebera.
Osage	krabrah.

With the book in question Cass's vocabulary coincides.

	Hamilton and Irvine.	Cass.
fire	pæchæ	pedge.
water	ne	ni.
one	eyungkæ	iengki
two	nowæ	noe.
three	tanye	tahni.
four	towæ	toe.

	Hamilton and Irvine.	Cass.
five	thata	satahng.
six	shagæ	shangwe.
seven	shahma	shahmong.
eight	kræræpane	krehebni.
nine	ksangkæ	shange.
ten	kræpanæ	krebnah.

ON A SHORT VOCABULARY OF THE LOUCHEUX LANGUAGE.

BY J. A. ISBISTER.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

JANUARY 25TH 1850.

This notice, being communicated by myself, and making part of the subject illustrated by both the papers that precede and the papers that follow, is here inserted.

The Digothe, or Loucheux, is the language of the North American Indians of the lower part of the river Mackenzie, a locality round which languages belonging to three different classes are spoken — the Eskimo, the Athabaskan, and the Koluch (Kolosh) of Russian America.

To which of these classes the Loucheux belongs, has hitherto been unascertained. It is learned with equal ease by both the Eskimo and Athabascan interpreters; at the same time an interpreter is necessary.

The following short vocabulary, however, shows that its more probable affinities are in another direction, *i. e.* with the languages of Russian America, especially with the Kenay of Cook's Inlet; with which, whilst the pronouns agree, the remaining words differ no more than is usual with lists equally imperfect, even in languages where the connexion is undoubted.

English.	Loucheux.	Kenay.
white man	manah-gool-ait.	
Indian	tenghie*	teena = *man.*
Eskimo	nak-high.	
wind	etsee.	
head wind	newatsee.	
fair wind	jeatsee.	
water	tchon†	thun-agalgus.

* The *g* is sounded *hard.* † As the French *n* in *bon.*

English.	Loucheux.	Kenay.
sun	shethie	channoo.
moon	shet-sill	tlakannoo.
stars	kumshaet	ssin
meat	beh	kutskonna.
deer	et-han.	
head	umitz	aissagge
arm	tchiegen	skona.
leg	tsethan.	
coat	chiegee.	
blanket	tsthee.	
knife	tlay	kissaki.
fort	jetz.	
yes	eh.	
no	illuck-wha.	
far	nee-jah.	
near	neak-wha.	
strong	nehaintah.	
cold	kateitlee	ktekchuz.
long	kawa.	
enough	ekcho, ekatarainyo.	
eat	beha.	
drink	chidet-leh.	
come	chatchoo.	
go away	eenio.	
I	see	su.
thou	nin	nan.
(my) father	(se) tsay	stukta.
(my) son	(se) jay	*ssi*-ja.

NOTES.

The notices upon the American languages at the British Association between the date of the last paper but one and the next were :

That the Bethuk of Newfoundland was American rather than Eskimo — *Report for* 1847. *Transactions of the Section p.* 115.

That the Shyenne numerals were Algonkin — Report for 1847. *Transactions of Sections p.* 123.

That neither
The Moskito, nor
The Botocudo language were isolated. — *Ibid.*

ON THE LANGUAGES OF NEW CALIFORNIA.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

MAY 13TH 1853.

The languages of the south-western districts of the Oregon territory are conveniently studied in the admirable volume upon the Philology of the United States Exploring Expedition, by Mr Hale. Herein we find that the frontier between that territory and California is most probably formed by the Saintskla, Umkwa, and Lutuami languages, the Saintskla being spoken on the sea-coast, the Umkwa lying to the east of it, and the Lutuami east of the Umkwa. All three, in the present state of our knowledge, belong to different philological divisions. It is unnecessary to add, that each tongue covers but a small geographical area.

The Paduca area extends in a south-eastern direction in such a manner as to lap round the greater part of California and New Mexico, to enclose both of those areas, and to prolong itself into Texas; and that so far southwards as almost to reach the Gulf of Mexico. Hence, except at the south and the north-west, the Californian languages (and indeed the New Mexican as well) are cut off and isolated from the other tongues of America by means of this remarkable extension of the Paducas. The Paduca tongues dip into each of these countries as well as lap round them. It is convenient to begin with a Paduca language.

The *Wihinast* is, perhaps, an Oregon rather than a Californian language; though at the same time it is probably common to the two countries. It can be shown to be Paduca by its vocabulary in Mr. Hale's work, the Shoshoni being the language to which it comes nearest; indeed Mr. Gallatin calls the Wihinast the Western Shoshoni. Due east of the Wihinast come the Bonak Indians, currently believed to be Paduca, but still requiring the evidence of a vocabulary to prove them so.

The true Shoshoni succeed; and these are, probably, Oregon rather than Californian. At any rate, their language falls within the study of the former country. But the Uta Lake is truly a part of the great Californian basin, and the Uta language is known to us from a vocabulary, and known to be Paduca:

English.	uta*	Comanch†
sun	tap	taharp.
moon	mahtots	mush.
star	quahlantz	táarch.
man	tooonpayah	tooavishchee.
woman	naijah	wyapee.
boy	ahpats	tooanickpee.
girl	mahmats	wyapeechee.
head	tuts	páaph.
forehead	muttock	——
face	kooelp	koveh.
eye	puttyshoe	nachich.
nose	mahvetah	moopee.
mouth	timp	teppa.
teeth	tong	tahnee.
tongue	ahoh	ahako.
chin	hannockquell	——
ear	uink	nahark.
hair	suooh	parpee.
neck	kolph	toyock.
arm	pooir	mowa.
hand	masseer	mowa.
breast	pay	toko.
foot	namp	nahap.
horse	kahvah	teheyar.
serpent	toeweroe	noheer.
dog	sahreets	shardee.
cat	moosah	——
fire	coon	koona.
food	oof	——
water	pah	pahar.

The Uta being thus shown to be Paduca, the evidence in favour of other tribes in their neighbourhood being Paduca also is improved. Thus —

---

* Reports of the Secretary of War, with Reconnaissances of route from San Antonio to El Paso. Washington, 1850. (Appendix B.)

† From a Nauni Vocabulary, by R. S. Neighbour; Schoolcraft's History, &c., Pt. ii.

The Diggers are generally placed in the same category with the Bonaks, and sometimes considered as Bonaks under another name.

The Sampiches, lying south of the Uta, are similarly considered Uta. Special vocabularies, however, are wanting.

The Uta carry us from the circumference of the great basin to an angle formed by the western watershed of the Rio Grande and the rivers Colorado and Gila; and the language that comes next is that of the Navahos. Of these, the Jecorillas of New Mexico are a branch. We have vocabularies of each of these dialects tabulated with that of the Uta and collected by the same inquirer.

Mr. Hale, in the "Philology" of the United States Exploring Expedition, showed that the Tlatskanai and Umkwa were outlying languages of the great Athabaskan family.

It has since been shown by Professor Turner that certain Apatch languages are in the same interesting and important class, of which Apatch languages the Navaho and Jecorilla are two.

Now follows a population which has stimulated the attention and excited the wonder of ethnologists — the Moqui. The Moqui are they who, occupants of some of the more favoured parts of the country between the Gila and Colorado, have so often been contrasted with the ruder tribes around them — the Navaho and Uta in particular. The Moqui, too, are they whose ethnological relations have been looked for in the direction of Mexico and the semi-civilized Indians of Central America. Large towns, regular streets, stone buildings, white skins, and European beards have all been attributed to these mysterious Moqui. They seem, however, to be simply Indians whose civilization is that of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. The same table that gives us the Uta and Navaho vocabularies, gives us a Moqui one also. In this, about eight words in twenty-one are Uta.

Languages allied to the Uta, the Navaho, and the Moqui, may or may not fill up nine-tenths of what an Indian would call the Doab, or a Portuguese the Entre Rios, *i. e.* the parts between the two rivers Gila and Colorado. Great as has been the activity of the American surveyors, the exploration is still incomplete. This makes it convenient to pass at once to the head of the Gulf of California. A fresh language now presents itself, spoken at the head of the peninsula (or Acte) of *Old* California. The vocabulary that has longest represented this tongue is that of the Mission of Saint Diego on the Pacific; but the language itself, ex-

tended across the head of the *Acte*, reaches the mouth of the Colorado, and is prolonged, to some distance at least, beyond the junction of the Gila.

Of the Dieguno language — for such seems to be the Spanish name for it — Dr. Coulter has given one vocabulary, and Lieut. Whipple (U. S. A.) another. The first is to be found in the Journal of the Geographical Society, the second is the second part of Schoolcraft's "History, &c. of Indian Tribes." A short but unique vocabulary of Lieutenant Emory, of the language of the Cocomaricopas Indians, was known to Gallatin. This is closely allied to the Dieguno.

A Paternoster in Mofras belongs to the Mission of San Diego. It has not been collated with the vocabularies, which are, probably, too scanty to give definite results; there is no reason, however, to doubt its accuracy: —

Nagua anall amai tacaguach naguanetuuxp mamamulpo cayuca amaibo, mamatam meyayam canaao amat amaibo quexuic echasau naguagui ñañacachon ñaguin ñipil meñeque pachís echeyuchap oñagua quexuíc ñaguaich ñacaquailipo ñamechamec anipuchuch-guelichcuíapo. Nacuíuch-pambo-cuchlich-cuíatpo-ñamat. Napuija.

A *third* branch, however, of this division, constituted by a language called the Cuchañ, of which a specimen is given by Lieut. Whipple (*vide supra*), is still nearer to the latter of those two forms of speech.

There can be but little doubt that a combination of sounds expressed by the letters *thl* in the Dieguno tongue, represents the sound of the Mexican *tl*; a sound of which the distribution has long drawn the attention of investigators. Common in the languages of Mexican, common in the languages of the northern parts of Oregon, sought for amongst the languages of Siberia, it here appears — whatever may be its value as a characteristic — as Californian. The names of the Indians whose language is represented by the specimens just given are not ascertained with absolute exactitude. Mofras mentions the Yumas and Amaquaquas.

The Mission of San Luis *Rey de Francia* (to be distinguished from that of San Luis *Obispo*) comes next as we proceed northwards.

Between $33^1/_2{}^0$ and 34^0, a new language makes its appearance. This is represented by four vocabularies, two of which take the designation from the name of the tribe, and two from the Mission in which it is spoken. Thus, the Netela language of the United States Exploring Expedition is the same as the San Juan Capistrano of Dr. Coulter,

and the San Gabriel of Dr. Coulter the same as the Kij of the United States Exploring Expedition.

The exact relation of these two languages to each other is somewhat uncertain. They are certainly languages of the same group, if not dialects of the same language. In the case of *r* and *l*, a regular letter-change exists between them. Thus Dr. Coulter's tables give us

English.	San Gabriel.	San Juan Capistrano.
moon	muarr	mioil.
water	paara	pal.
earth	ungkhur	ekhel.
salt	ungurr	engel.
hot	oro	khalek.

whilst in the United States Exploring Expedition we find —

English.	Kij.	Netela.
moon	moar	moil.
star	suot	suol.
water	bar	pal.
bear	humar	hunot.

Of these forms of speech the San Gabriel or Kij is the more northern; the San Juan Capistrano or Netela being the nearest to the Dieguno localities. The difference between the two groups is pretty palpable. The San Gabriel and San Juan numerals of Mofras represent the Netela-Kij language.

It is remarked in Gallatin's paper that there were certain coincidences between the Netela and the Shoshoni. There is no doubt as to the existence of a *certain amount* of likeness between the two languages.

Jujubit, Caqullas, and Sibapot are the names of San Gabriel tribes mentioned by Mofras. The Paternoster of the three last-named missions are as follows: —

Langue de la Mission de San Gabriel. — Y Yonac y yogin tucu pugnaisa sujucoy motuanian masarmí magin tucupra maïmanó muísme millcosar y ya tucupar jiman bxi y yoné masaxmí mitema coy aboxmi y yo mamaínatar momojaích milli y yakma abonac y yo no y yo ocaihuc coy jaxmea main itan momosaích coy jama juexme huememes aích. Amen. Jesus.

Langue de la Mission de San Juan Capistrano. — Chana ech tupana ave onench, otunc a cuachin, chame om reino, libi yb chosonec esna tupana cham nechetepe, micate tom cha chaom, pepsum yg cai caychame y i julugcalme cai ech. Depupnn opco chame chum oyote. Amen. Jesus.

Langue de la Mission de San Luiz Rey de Francia. — Cham

na cham meg tu panga auc onan mo quiz cham to qai ha cua che nag omreina h vi hiche ca noc ybá heg gá y vi an qui gá topanga. Cham na cholane mim cha pan pitu mag ma jan pohi cala cai qui cha me holloto gai tom chama o gui chag cay ne che cal me tus so lli olo calme alla linoc chame cham cho sivo. Amen. Jésus.

The following is the Paternoster of the Mission of San Fernando. It is taken from Mofras: —

Y yorac yona taray tucúpuma sagoucó motoanian majarmi moin main monó muismi miojor y iactucupar. Pan yyogin gimiarnerin majarmi mi fema coyó ogorná yio mamarimy mii, yiarmá ogonug y yoná, y yo ocaynen coijarmea main ytomo mojay coiyamá huermí. Parima.

The Mission of San Fernando lies between that of San Gabriel and Santa Barbara. Santa Barbara's channel (between 34° and $34^1/_2{}^0$ N. L.) runs between the mainland and some small islands. From these parts we have two vocabularies, Revely's and Dr. Coulter's. The former is known to me only through the Mithridates, and has only three words that can be compared with the other: —

English.	Revely's.	Coulter's.
one	pacà	paka.
two	excò	shko*ho*.
three	mapja	*ma*sekh.

The Mission of Santa Ines lies between that of Santa Barbara and that of San Luis Obispo, in $35^2/_3$ N. L.; which last supplies a vocabulary, one of Dr. Coulter's: —

English.	San Luis Obispo.	Santa Barbara.
water	to	oh.
stone	tkeup	kheup.
three	misha	masekh.
bow	takha	akha.
salt	tepu	tipi.

This is the amount of likeness between the two forms of speech — greater than that between the Netela and Dieguno, but less than that between the Netela and Kij.

Dr. Coulter gives us a vocabulary for the Mission of San Antonio, and the United States Exploring Expedition one from San Miguel, the latter being very short:

English.	San Miguel.	English.	San Miguel.
man	luai,loai, logua.	*mother*	apai.
woman	tlene.	*son*	paser, pasel.
father	tata.	*daughter*	paser, pasel.

English.	San Miguel.	English.	San Miguel.
head	to-buko.	*nose*	te-n-ento.
hair	te-asakho.	*eyes*	t-r-ugento.
ears	te-n-tkhito.	*mouth*	t-r-eliko (lak-um, *St. Raph.)*

With the San Antonio it has six words in common, of which two coincide: *e. g.* in San Antonio *man* = *luah*, *mother* = *epjo*. Besides which, the combination *tr*, and the preponderance of initials in *t*, are common to the two vocabularies. San Antonio is spoken about $36^1/_2{}^0$ N. L. The numerals, too, are very similiar, since the *ki-* and *ka-* in the San Antonio numeration for *one*, *two*, seems non-radical: —

English.	San Miguel.	San Antonio.
one	tohi	ki-tol.
two	kugsu	ka-kishe.
three	tlubahi	klap'hai.
four	kesa	kisha.
five	oldrato	ultraoh.
six	paiate	painel.
seven	tepa	te'h.
eight	sratel	shaanel.
nine	tedi-trup	teta-tsoi.
ten	trupa	tsoeh.

It is safe to say that these two vocabularies represent one and the same language.

About fifty miles to the north-west of St. Miguel lies La Soledad, for which we have a short vocabulary of Mr. Hale's: —

English.	La Soledad.	English.	La Soledad.
man	mue.	*head*	tsop.
woman	shurishme.	*hair*	worokh.
father	ni-ka-pa.	*cars*	otsho.
mother	ni-ka-na.	*nose*	us (oos, *Castano).*
son	ni-ki-nish.	*eyes*	hiin (hin, *Talatui).*
daughter	ni-ka	*mouth*	hai.

The word *nika*, which alone denotes *daughter*, makes the power of the syllable *ka* doubtful. Nevertheless, it is probably non-radical. In ni-k*i*-n*i*sh, as opposed to ni-k*a*-n*a*, we have an apparent accommodation (*umlaut*); a phenomenon not wholly strange to the American form of speech.

Is this the only language of these parts? Probably not. The numerals of language from this Mission are given by Mofras, and the difference between them and those of Mr. Hale is as follows: —

English.	Mofras Sol.	Hale's Sol.
one	enkala	himitna.
two	oultes	utshe.
three	kappes	kap-kha.
four	oultezim	utjit.
five	haliizon	paruash.
six	hali-skakem	iminuksha.
seven	kapka-mai	uduksha.
eight	oulton-mai	taitemi.
nine	pakke	watso.
ten	tam-chakt	matsoso.

There is some affinity, but it is not so close as one in another quarter; *i. e.* one with the Achastli and Ruslen.

Between 36° and 37° N. L. lies the town of Monterey. For this neighbourhood we have the Ruslen east, and the Eslen west, the latter being called also Ecclemachs. Bourgoing and De La Manon are the authorities for the scanty vocabularies of these two forms of speech, to which is added one of the Achastli. The Achastli, the Ruslen, and the Soledad of Mofras seem to represent one and the same language. The converse, however, does not hold good, *i. e.* the Soledad of Hale is not the Eslenes of Bourgoing and the Ecclemachs of De La Manon. This gives us four languages for these parts: —

1. The one represented by the San Miguel and San Antonio vocabulary.

2. The one represented by the Soledad of Hale.

3. The one represented by the Soledad of Mofras, the Achastli of De La Manon, and the Ruslen of Bourgoing.

4. The one represented by the Eslen of Bourgoing and the Ecclemachs of De La Manon, and also by a vocabulary yet to be noticed, viz. that of the Mission of Carmel of Mofras.

English.	Carmel.	Eslen.	Soledad *(of Mofras)*.	Ruslen.
one	pek	pek	enkala	enjala.
two	oulhaj	ulhaj	oultes	ultis.
three	koulep	julep	kappes	kappes.
four	kamakous	jamajus	oultizim	ultizim.
five	pemakala	pemajala	haliizon	hali-izu.
six	pegualanai	peguatanoi	halishakem	hali-shakem.
seven	kulukulanai	julajualanei	kapkamai	kapkamai-shakem.
eight	kounailepla	julep jualanei	oultonmai	ultumai-shakem.
nine	kakouslanai	jamajas jualanei	pakke	packe.
ten	tomoila	tomoila	tamchakt	tamchait.

We now approach the parts of California which are best known — the Bay of San Francisco in 38° N. L. For these parts the Mission of Dolores gives us the names of the following populations: — 1. Ahwastes. 2. Olhones (Costanos or Coastmen). 3. Altahmos. 4. Romonans. 5. Tulomos.

For the same parts we have vocabularies of four languages which are almost certainly mutually unintelligible. Two are from Baer's *Beiträge;* they were collected during the time of the Russian settlement at Ross. One represents the language of certain Indians called *Olamentke*, the other that of certain Indians called *Khwakhlamayu*. The other two are from the second part of Schoolcraft. One is headed Costano = the language of the Indians of the coast; the other Cushna. The language represented by the Cushna vocabulary can be traced as far inland as the Lower Sacramiento. Here we find the Bush*umni* (or Pujuni), the Sec*umni*, the Yas*umni*, the Yales*umni*, the Nemshaw, the Kiski, the Huk, and the Yukae tribes, whose languages, or dialects, are represented by three short vocabularies, collected by Mr. Dana, viz. the Pujuni, the Sekumne, and the Tsamak.

The following extract shows the extent to which these three forms of speech agree and differ: —

English.	Pujuni.	Sekumne.	Tsamak.
man	çune	mailik	mailik.
woman	kele	kele	kule.
child	——	maidumonai	——
daughter	——	eti	——
head	tçutçúl	tsol	tçultçul.
hair	oi	ono	oi.
ear	onó	bono	orro.
eye	watça	il	hil.
nose	henka	suma	——
mouth	moló	sim	——
neck	tokotók	kui	kulut.
arm	ma	wah	kalut.
hand	tçapai	ma	tamsult *or* tamtçut.
fingers	tçikikup	biti	tcikikup;
leg	pai	podo	bimpi.
foot	kat*up*	pai	pai.
toe	ta*p*	biti	——
house	hē	hē	——
bow	ōlumni	——	——
arrow	huiā	——	——
shoes	——	sol*um*	——
beads	——	hawūt	——

English.	Pujuni.	Sekumne.	Tsamak.
sky	hibi	——	——
sun	oko	oko	——
day	oko'	eki	——
night	——	po	——
fire	ça	sa	ça.
water	momi, mop	mop	momi.
river	lókolók	mumdi	munti.
stone	o	o	——
tree	tça	tsa	——
grapes	——	muti	——
deer	wil	kut	kut.
bird	——	tsit	——
fish	——	pala	——
salmon	mai	mai	——
name	——	ianó	——
good	huk	wenne	huk.
bad	——	tçoç	maidik
old	——	hawil	——
new	——	be	——
sweet	——	sudúk	——
sour	——	oho	——
hasten	——	iewa	——
run	tshel	gewa	——
walk	iye	wiye	——
swim	pi	——	——
talk	wiwina	enun	——
sing	——	tsol	——
dance	——	paio	——
one	ti	wikte.	——
two	teene	pen	——
three	shupui.	sapui	——
four	pehel	tsi	——
five	mustic	mauk	——
six	tini, o *(sic)*	tini, a *(sic)*	——
seven	tapui	pensi (?) *sic.*	——
eight	petshei	tapau (?) *sic.*	——
nine	matshum	mutsnm	——
ten	tshapanaka	aduk	——

On the Kassima River, a tributary of the Sacramiento, about eighty miles from its mouth lives a tribe whose language is called the Talatui, and is represented by a vocabulary of Mr. Dana's. It belongs, as Gallatin has suggested, to the same class with the language of San Raphael, as given in a vocabulary of Mr. Hale's: —

English.	Talatui.	San Raphael.
man	sawe	lamantiya.
woman	esuu	kulaish.
father	tata	api.
daughter	tele	ai.
head	tikit	molu.
ear	*alok*	*alokh.*
eye	wilai	shuta.
nose	*uk*	*huke.*
mouth	hube	lakum.
hand	*iku*	*akue.*
foot	subei	koio.
sun	*hi*	*hi.*
day	*hi* umu	*hi.*
night	ka-*wil*	*wal*ayuta.
fire	*wike*	*waik.*
water	*kik*	*kiik.*
stone	sawa	lupoii.
bird	lune, ti	kakalis.
house	*kodja*	*koitaya.*
one	*kenate*	*kenai.*
two	*oyo*-ko	*oza.*
three	*teli*-ko	*tula*-ka.
four	oiçu-ko	wiag.
five	kassa-ko	kenekus.
six	temebo	patirak.
seven	kanikuk (?) *sic*	semlawi.
eight	kauinda	wusuya.
nine	ooi	umarask.
ten	ekuye	kitshish.

North of San Francisco, at least along the coast, we have no vocabularies of any language undoubtedly and exclusively Californian. Thus, the Lutuami, the Shasti and Palaik are, in all probability, common to California and Oregon. Of each of these languages Mr. Hale has given us a vocabulary. The Lutuami live on the headwaters of the river and lake Tlamatl, or Clamet, conterminous on the south-east with the Palaiks, and on the south-west with the Shasti. The affinity between the Palaik and Lutuami seems to be somewhat greater than that between the Lutuami and Shasti.

And now we have gone *round* California; for, conterminous, on the east, with the Lutuami and Shasti are the Wihinast and Paduca with whom we began, and it is only by the comparatively narrow strip of country occupied by the three tribes just enumerated that the great Paduca area is

separated from the Pacific. How far the Shasti and Palaik areas extend in the direction of the head-waters of the Sacramiento is uncertain. A separate language, however, seems to be represented by a vocabulary, collected by Mr. Dana from the Indians who lie about 250 miles from its mouth. From the Lutuami, the Shasti, the Palaik, and Jakon, northwards, and from the Pujuni, Talatui and other dialects lower down the river, it seems distinct. It is just more like the Jakon than any other form of speech equally distant. Neither is it Shoshoni: —

Engl.	U. Sacr.	Engl.	U. Sacr.
sun	sas.	*nose*.....	tsono. tusina *Jakon.* suma *Sek.*
fire	po.		
water	meim. momi *Puj. Tsam.* mop *Sek.*	*mouth*	kal. khai *Jakon.* hai *Soledad.*
hair.....	to-moi.	*chin*.....	kentikut.
eye	tu-mut.	*forehead*	tei.
arm.....	keole.	*knife*	kelekele.
finger	tsemut. tamtçut = hand *Tsam.*	*iron*.....	kelekele.
		grape	uyulu.
leg	tole. kolo *Talat.*	*rush*	tso.
foot.....	ktamoso.	*eat*	ba, bas.
knee	huiuk.	*see*	wila.
deer.....	nop.	*go*	hara.
salmon.....	monok.		

Slight as is this preponderance of affinity with the Jakon, it is not to be ignored altogether. The displacements between the two areas have been considerable and though the names of as many as five intermediate tribes are known, we have no specimens of their languages. These tribes are —

1. The Kaus, between the rivers Umkwa and Clamet, and consequently not far from the head-waters of the Sacramiento.

2. 3. The Tsalel and Killiwashat, on the Umkwa.

4. The Saintskla between these and the Jakon, the Jakon being between the Tlatskanai and Umkwa.

Now as these last are Athabaskan, there must have been displacement. But there are further proofs. North of the isolated and apparently intrusive Tlatskanai lie the Nsietshawas — isolated and apparently intrusive also; since they belong to the great Atna stock of Frazer's River.

The Jakon, then, and the Indians of the Upper Sacramiento may belong to the same stock — a stock which will be continuous in its area in case intermediate tribes

prove referable to it, and interrupted in its area if they do not. At any rate, the *direction* of the Jakons is important.

The following Paternosters from Mofras, referable to the parts about San Francisco, require fixing. They can probably be distributed among the languages ascribed to that district — not, however, by the present writer: —

Langue de la Mission de Santa Clara. — Appa macréne mé saura saraahtiga elecpuhmem imragat, sacan macréne mensaraah assuevy nouman ourun macari pireca numa ban saraahiga poluma macréne souhaii naltis anat macréne neéna, ia annanet macréne meena, ia annanet macréne macrec équetr maccari noumbasi macre annan, non maroté jessember macrene in eckoué tamouniri innam tattahné, icatrarca oniet macréne equets naccaritkoun och á Jésus.

Langue de la Mission de Santa Ines. — Dios caquicoco upalequen alapa, quiaenicho opte; paquininigug quique eccuet upalacs huatahuc itimisshup caneche alapa. Ulamuhu ilahulalisahue. Picsiyug equepe ginsucutaniyug uquiyagmagin, canechequique quisagin sucutanagun utiyagmayiyug peux hoyug quie utie lex ulechop santequiyung ilautechop. Amen. Jesus.

Langue de la Vallée de Los Tulares. — Appa macquen erignimo, tasunimac emracat, jinnin eccey macquen unisínmac macquen quitti éné soteyma crinigmo: sumimac macquen hamjamú jinnan guara ayei; sunnun maquen quit ti enesunumac ayacma; aquectsem unisimtac nininti equetmini: junná macquen equetmini em men.

Langue Giuluco de la Mission de San Francisco. — Allá-igamé mutryocusé mi zahuá om mi yahuatail cha usqui etra shon mur tzecali Ziam pac onjinta mul zhaiíge Nasoyate chelegua mul znatzoitze tzecali zicmatan zchütülaa chalehua mesqui pihuatzite yteima omahuá. Emqui. Jesus.

Langue Chocouyem du Rio del Sacramento. — Api maco su lileco ma nénas mi aués omai mácono mi taucuchs oyópa mi tauco chaquenit opú neyatto chequenit opu liletto. Tu maco muye genum ji naya macono sucuji sulia mácono mácocte, chaue mat opu ma suli mayaco. Macoi yangia ume omutto, ulémi mácono omu incapo. Nette esa Jesus.

Langue Joukiousmé de la Mission de San Raphael. — Api maco sa líleto manénas mi dues onía mácono michauka oiopa mitauka chakenit opu negata chàkenit opu lilèto, tumako muye quenunje naya macono sucuji snlia macóno masojte chake mat opu ma suli mayaco maco yangìa ume omut ulemi macono omu in capo. Netenti Jesus.

The numerals given by Mofras are as follows: —

Engl.	San Luis (Obispo).	San Juan Capistrano.	San Gabriel.
one	tchoumou	soupouhe	poukou.
two	eschiou	houah	guèpé.
three	micha	paai	pagi.
four	paksi	houasah	quatcha.
five	tizeoui	maha	makai.
six	ksoukouia	pomkalilo	pabai.
seven	ksouamiche	chouchoui	quachacabia.
eight	scomo	ouasa-kabia	quequacha.
nine	scoumo-tchi	ouasa-maha	majai-cayia.
ten	touymile	ouikinmaha	quejemajai.

ADDENDUM. — (Oct. 14, 1853.)

Since the previous paper was read, "Observations on some of the Indian dialects of Northern California, by G. Gibbs," have appeared in the 3rd Part of Schoolcraft (published 1853) (*vide* pp. 420—445).

The vocabularies, which are given in a tabulated form, are for the following twelve languages: —

1. Tchokoyem. 2. Copeh. 3. Kulanapo. 4. Yukai. 5. Choweshak. 6. Batemdakaiee. 7. Weeyot. 8. Wishok. 9. Weitspek. 10. Hoopah. 11. Tahlewah. 12. Ehnek.

Besides which three others have been collected, but do not appear in print, viz.: —

1. The Watsa-he-wa, spoken by one of the bands of the Shasti family.
2. The Howteteoh.
3. The Nabittse.

Of these the Tchokoyem = the *Chocouyem* of the Sacramiento, and the *Joukiousme* or San Raphael of Mofras; also Gallatin's San Raphael, and (more or less) the Talatui.

The Copeh is something (though less) like the short Upper Sacramiento specimen of the preceding paper.

The Yukai is, perhaps, less like the Pujuni, Sekume, and Tsamak vocabularies than the Copeh is to the Upper Sacramiento. Still, it probably belongs to the same class, since it will be seen that the Huk and Yukai languages are members of the group that Mr. Dana's lists represent. The

Kulanapo has a clear preponderance of affinities with the Yukae.

The Choweshak and Batemdakaice are allied. So are —

The Weeyot and the Wishok; in each of which the sound expressed by *tl'* occurs. These along with the Weitspek take *m* as the possessive prefix to the parts of the human body, and have other points of similarity.

English.	Weeyot.	Wishosk.
hair	pah'tl	paht'l.
foot	welhh'tl	wehlihl.

The Hoopah is more interesting than any. The names of the parts of the human body, when compared with the Navaho and Jecorilla, are as follows: —

English.	Hoopah.	Navaho.	Jecorilla.
head	okheh	hut-se	it-sê.
forehead	hotsintah	hut-tah	pin-nay.
face	haunith	hun-ne	——
eye	huanah	hunnah	pindah.
nose	huntchu	hutchin	witchess.
teeth	howwa	howgo	egho.
tongue	sastha	hotso	ezahte.
ear	hotcheweh	hutchah	wickyah.
hair	tsewok	hotse	itse.
neck	hosewatl	huckquoss	wickcost.
arm	hoithlani	hutcon	witse.
hand	hollah	hullah	wislah.

Here the initial combination of *h* and some other letter is (after the manner of so many American tongues) the possessive pronoun — alike in both the Navaho and Hoopah; many of the roots being also alike. Now the Navaho and Jecorilla are Athabaskan, and the Hoopah is probably Athabaskan also.

The Tahlewah and Ehnek are but little like each other, and little like any other language.

Although not connected with the languages of California, there is a specimen in the volume before us of a form of speech which has been already noticed in these Transactions, and which is by no means clearly defined. In the 28th Number, a vocabulary of the *Ahnenin* language is shown to be the same as that of the *Fall-Indians* of Umfreville. In Gallatin this *Ahnenin* vocabulary is quoted as *Arapaho*, or *Atsina*. Now it is specially stated that these *Arapaho* or

Atsina Indians are those who are also (though inconveniently or erroneously) called the *Gros Ventres*, the *Big Bellies* and the *Minitares* of the Prairie — all names for the Indians about the Falls of the Saskachewan, and consequently of Indians far north.

But this was only one of the populations named Arapaho. Other Arapahos are found on the head-waters of the Platte and Arkansas. Who were these? Gallatin connected them at once with those of the Saskachewan — but it is doubtful whether he went on better grounds than the name. A vocabulary was wanted.

The volume in question supplies one — collected by Mr. J. S. Smith. It shows that the two Arapahos are really members of one and the same class — in language as well as in name.

Upon the name itself more light requires to be thrown. In an alphabetical list of Indian populations in the same volume with the vocabulary, from which we learn that the new specimen is one of the *southern* (and not the *northern*) Arapaho, it is stated that the word means "*pricked*" or "*tattooed*." In what language? Perhaps in that of the Arapaho themselves; perhaps in that of the Sioux — since it is a population of the Sioux class which is in contact with *both* the Arapahos.

Again — if the name be native, which of the two divisions uses it? the northern or the southern? or both? If both use it, how comes the synonym Ahnenin? How, too, comes the form *Atsina*? Is it a typographical error? The present writer used the same MS. with Gallatin and found the name to be *Ahnenin*.

To throw the two Arapahos into one and the same class is only one step in our classification. Can they be referred to any wider and more general division? A Shyenne vocabulary is to be found in the same table; and Schoolcraft remarks that the two languages are allied. So they are. Now reasons have been given for placing the Shyenne in the great Algonkin class (*Philolog. Trans., and Transactions of the American Ethnological Society*, vol. ii. p. exi.).

There are similar affinities with the *Blackfoot*. Now, in the paper of these Transactions already referred to, it is stated that the affinities of the Blackfoot "are miscellaneous; more, however, with the Algonkin tongues than with those of any recognized group*." Gallatin takes the same view (*Transactions of American Ethnol. Soc.* vol. ii. p. cxiii.).

* No. 28. vol. ii. p. 34. Jan. 24, 1845.

This gives as recent additions to the class in question, the Blackfoot — the Shyenne — the Arapaho.

The southern Arapaho are immigrants, rather than *indigenæ*, in their present localities. So are the Shyennes, with whom they are conterminous.

The original locality of the southern Arapahos was on the Saskachewan; that of the Shyennes on the Red River. Hence, the affinity between their tongues represents an affinity arising out of their relations anterior to their migration southward.

ON CERTAIN ADDITIONS TO THE ETHNOGRAPHICAL PHILOLOGY OF CENTRAL AMERICA, WITH REMARKS UPON THE SO-CALLED ASTEK CONQUEST OF MEXICO.

READ

BEFORE THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

May 12, 1854.

In Central America we have two points for which our philological *data* have lately received additions, viz. the parts about the Lake Nicaragua and the Isthmus of Darien.

For the parts about the Lake of Nicaragua, the chief authority is Mr. Squier; a writer with whom we differ in certain points, but, nevertheless, a writer who has given us both materials and results of great value. The languages represented, for the first time, by his vocabularies are four in number, of which three are wholly new, whilst one gives us a phenomenon scarcely less important than an absolutely fresh form of speech; viz. the proof of the occurrence of a known language in a new, though not unsuspected, locality.

To these four a fifth may be added; but, as that is one already illustrated by the researches of Henderson, Cotheal and others, it does not come under the category of new material. This language is that of the

Indians of the Mosquito coast. — Respecting these Mr. Squier commits himself to the doctrine that they are more or less Carib. They may be this in physiognomy. They may also be so in respect to their civilization, or want of civilization; and perhaps this is all that is meant, the words of our author being, that "upon the low alluvions, and amongst the dense dank forests of the Atlantic coast, there exist a few scanty, wandering tribes, maintaining a precarious existence by

hunting and fishing, with little or no agriculture, destitute of civil organization, with a debased religion, and generally corresponding with the Caribs of the islands, to whom they sustain close affinities. A portion of their descendants, still further debased by the introduction of negro blood, may still be found in the wretched Moscos or Mosquitos. The few and scattered Melchoras, on the river St. Juan, are certainly of Carib stock, and it is more than probable that the same is true of the Woolwas, Ramas, Toacas, and Poyas, and also of the other tribes on the Atlantic coast, further to the southward, towards Chiriqui Lagoon, and collectively denominated Bravos." — *Central America and Nicaragua*, ii. pp. 308-309.

Nevertheless, as has been already stated, the language is other than Carib. It is other than Carib, whether we look to the Moskito or the Woolwa vocabularies. It is other than Carib, and admitted by Mr. Squier to be so. The previous extract has given us his opinion; what follows supports it by his reasons. "I have said that the Indians of the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua, the Moscos and others, were probably of Carib stock. This opinion is founded not only upon the express statements of Herrara, who says that 'the Carib tongue was much spoken in Nicaragua,' but also upon their general appearance, habits and modes of life. Their language does not appear to have any direct relationship with that of the Southern Caribs, but is, probably, the same, or a dialect of the same with that spoken around what is now called Chiriqui Lagoon, near the Isthmus of Panama, and which was originally called Chiribiri or Chraibici, from which comes Gomera's Caribici, or Carib." In a note we learn that "thirteen leagues from the Gulf of Nicoya, Oviedo speaks of a village called Carabizi, where the same language was spoken as at Chiriqui," &c.

Of the Melchora we have no specimens. For each and every tribe, extant or extinct, of the Indians about the Chiriqui Lagoon we want them also. The known vocabularies, however, for the parts nearest that locality are other than Carib.

Let us, however, look further, and we shall find good reasons for believing that certain populations of the parts in question are called, by the Spaniards of their neighbourhood, Caribs, much in the same way that they, along with nine-tenths of the other aborigines of America, are called *Indians* by us. "The region of Chantales," writes Mr. Squier, "was visited by my friend Mr. Julius Froebel, in the summer of this year (1851). He penetrated to the head-waters of the Rio Mico, Escondido, or Blue-fields, where he found the

Indians to be agriculturalists, partially civilized, and generally speaking the Spanish language. They are called Caribs by their Spanish neighbours," &c. But their language, of which Mr. Froebel collected a vocabulary, published by Mr. Squier, is, like the rest, *other than Carib.*

It may, then, safely be said, that the Carib character of the Moskito Indians, &c. wants confirmation.

Nicaragua. A real addition to our knowledge is supplied by M. Squier concerning the Nicaraguans. The statement of Oviedo as to the tribes between the Lake of Nicaragua and the Pacific, along with the occupants of the islands in the lake itself, being *Mexican* rather than indigenous, he confirms. He may be said to prove it; since he brings specimens of the language (*Niquiran*, as he calls it), which is as truly Mexican as the language of Sydney or New York is English.

The Mexican character of the Nicaraguan language is a definite addition to ethnographical philology. It may now be considered as settled, that one of the languages of the parts under notice is intrusive, and foreign to its present locality.

The remaining vocabularies represent four indigenous forms of speech; these (three of them of Mr. Squier's own earliest publication, and one known before) being —

1. The Chorotegan or Dirian of Squier — This was collected by the author from the Indians of Masaya, on the northern frontier of the Niquiran, Nicaraguan, Mexican or Astek area.

2. The Nagrandan of Squier — This was collected by the author from the Indians of Subtiaba, in the plain of Leon, to the *north* of the Niquiran or Mexican area.

3. The Chontales, or Woolwa, of Froebel; Chontal being the name of the district, Woolwa, of the tribe.

4. The Mosquito (or Waikna) of the coast.

To these four indigenous tongues (the Mexican of Nicaragua being dealt with as a foreign tongue), what have we to say in the way of classification?

It is safe to say that the Nagrandan, Dirian, and Woolwa, are more like each other than they are to the Mosca, Mosquito, or Waikna. And this is important, since, when Froebel collected the Woolwa vocabulary, he found a tradition of their having come originally from the shores of Lake Managua; this being a portion of the Dirian and Nagrandan area. If so, the classification would be,—

a. Dirian, Nagrandan, and Chontal, or Woolwa (Wúlwa)

b. Mosquito, or Waikna.

The value of these two divisions is, of course, uncertain; and, in the present state of our knowledge, it would be premature to define it. Equally uncertain is the value of the subdivisions of the first class. All that can be said is, that out of four mutually unintelligible tongues, three seem rather more allied to each other than the fourth.

Besides the vocabulary of the Nagrandan of Mr. Squier, there is a grammatical sketch by Col. Francesco Diaz Zapata.

Veragua — We pass now from the researches of Mr. Squier in Nicaragua to those of Mr. B. Seemann, Naturalist to the Herald, for the Isthmus of Panama. The statement of Colonel Galindo, in the Journal of the Geographical Society, that the native Indian languages of Honduras, Nicaragua, San Salvador, and Costarica, had been replaced by the Spanish, has too implicitly been adopted; by no one, however, more so than the present writer. The same applies to Veragua.

Here, Dr. Seemann has supplied: —

1. The Savaneric, from the northernmost part of Veragua.
2. The Bayano, from the river Chepo.
3. The Cholo, widely spread in New Grenada. This is the same as Dr. Cullen's Yule.

Specimens of the San Blas, or Manzanillo Indians, are still desiderated, it being specially stated that the number of tribes is not less than four, and the four languages belonging to them as different.

All that can at present be said of the specimens before us is, that they have miscellaneous, but no exact and definite affinities.

Mexicans of Nicaragua. From the notice of these additions to our *data* for Central America in the way of raw material, we proceed to certain speculations suggested by the presence of the Mexicans of Nicaragua in a locality so far south of the city of Mexico as the banks and islands of the lake of that name.

First as to their designation. It is not *Astek* (or *Aste̜ca*), as was that of the allied tribes of Mexico. Was it native, or was it only the name which their neighbours gave them? Was it a word like *Deutsch* (applied to the population of Westphalia, Oldenburg, the Rhine districts, &c.), or a word like *German* and *Allemand?* Upon this point no opinion is hazarded.

Respecting, however, the word *Astek* (*Asteca*) itself, the present writer commits himself to the doctrine that it was *no* native name at all, and that it was a word belonging to the *Maya*, and foreign to the Mexican, class of languages. It was as foreign to the latter as *Welsh* is to the language

of the British Principality; as *German* or *Allemagne* to the High and Low Dutch forms of speech; as *barbarus* to the languages in contact with the Latin and Greek, but not themselves either one or the other.

On the other hand, it was a Maya word, in the way that *Welsh* and *German* are English, and in the way that *Allemand* is a French one.

It was a word belonging to the country into which the Mexicans intruded, and to the populations upon which they encroached. These called their invaders *Asteca*, just as the Scotch Gael calls an Englishman, a *Saxon*.

a. The form is Maya, the termination *-eca* being common whereever any form of the Maya speech is to be found.

b. It is too like the word *Huasteca* to be accidental. Now, *Huasteca* is the name of a language spoken in the parts about Tampico; a language separated in respect to its geographical position from the other branches of the Maya family, (for which Guatemala and Yucatan are the chief localities) but not separated (as is indicated in the *Mithridates*) from these same Maya tongues philologically. Hence *Huasteca* is a Maya word; and what *Huasteca* is, *Asteca* is likely to be.

The isolation of the *Huasteca* branch of the Maya family indicates invasion, encroachment, conquest, displacement; the invaders, &c. being the Mexicans, called by themselves by some name hitherto undetermined, but by the older occupants of the country, *Astek*.

It is believed, too, though this is more or less of an *obiter dictum*, that nine-tenths of the so-called Mexican civilization, as indicated by its architecture, &c., was Maya, *i. e.* was referable to the old occupants rather than to the new invaders; standing in the same relation to that of the Mexicans, strictly speaking, as that of Italy did to that of the Goths and Lombards.

Whence came these invaders? The evidence of the *phonetic* part of the language points to the parts about Quadra and Vancouver's Island, and to the populations of the Upper Oregon — populations like the Chinuk, the Salish, the Atna, &c. Here, for the first time, we meet with languages where the peculiar phonesis of the Mexican language, the preponderance of the sound expressed by *tl*, reappears. For all the intermediate parts, with one or two exceptions, the character of the phonesis is Maya, *i. e.* soft, vocalic, and marked by the absence of those harsh elements that characterize the Mexican, the Chinuk, and the Atna equally. The extent to which the glossarial evidence agrees with the phonetic has yet to

be investigated, the doctrine here indicated being a suggestion rather than aught else.

So is the doctrine that both the Nicaraguan and Mexican invasions were *maritime*. Strange as this may sound in the case of an ordinary American population, it should not do so in the case of a population deduced from the Chinuk and Salish areas and from the archipelago to the north of Quadra's and Vancouver's Island. However, it is not the fact itself that is of so much value. The principle involved in its investigation is weightier. This is, that the distribution of an allied population, *along a coast, and at intervals*, is *primâ facie* evidence of the ocean having been the path along which they moved.

NOTE (1859).

For exceptions to the doctrine here suggested see Notes on the last paper.

NOTE UPON A PAPER OF THE HONOURABLE CAPTAIN FITZROY'S ON THE ISTHMUS OF PANAMA,

PUBLISHED

IN THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY.

NOVEMBER 25. 1850.

On the Language of Central America.

In Yucatan the structure and details of the language are sufficiently known, and so are the ethnological affinities of the tribes who speak it. This language is the Maya tongue, and its immediate relations are with the dialects of Guatemala. It is also allied to the Huasteca spoken so far N. as the Texian frontier, and separated from the other Maya tongues by dialects of the Totonaca and Mexican. This remarkable relationship was known to the writers of the Mithridates.

In South America the language begins to be known when we reach the equator; *e. g.* at Quito the Inca language of the Peruvian begins, and extends as far south as the frontier of Chili.

So much for the extreme points; between which the whole intermediate space is very nearly a *terra incognita.*

In Honduras, according to Colonel Galindo, the Indians are extinct; and as no specimen of their language has been preserved from the time of their existence as a people, that state is a blank in philology.

So also are San Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica; in all of which there are native Indians, but native Indians who speak Spanish. Whether this implies the absolute extinction of the native tongue is uncertain: it is only certain that no specimens of it are known.

The Indian of the Moskito coast *is* known; and that through both vocabularies and grammars. It is a remarkably unaffiliated language — more so than any one that I have ever compared. Still, it has a few miscellaneous affinities; just enough to save it from absolute isolation. When we remember that the dialects with which it was conterminous are lost, this is not remarkable. Pro-

bably it represents a large class, *i. e.* that which comprised the languages of Central America *not* allied to the Maya, and the languages of New Grenada.

Between the Moskito country and Quito there are only two vocabularies in the Mithridates, neither of which extends far beyond the numerals. One is that of the dialects of Veragua called Darien, and collected by Wafer; the other the numerals of the famous Muysca language of the plateau of Santa Fé de Bogota. With these exceptions, the whole philology of New Grenada is unknown, although the old missionaries counted the mutually unintelligible tongues by the dozen or score. More than one modern author—the present writer amongst others—has gone so far as to state that all the Indian languages of New Grenada are extinct.

Such is not the case. The following vocabulary, which in any other part of the world would be a scanty one, is for the parts in question of more than average value. It is one with which I have been kindly favoured by Dr. Cullen, and which represents the language of the Cholo Indians inhabiting part of the Isthmus of Darien, east of the river Chuquanaqua, which is watered by the river Paya and its branches in and about lat. 8^0 15′ N., and long. 77^0 20′ W.:—

English.	Cholo.	English.	Cholo.
Water	*payto*	Leon, *i.e.* large tiger	*imāmă pooroo*
Fire	*tŭboor*	River	*thō*
Sun	*pesea*	River Tuyra	*tŏgŭrooma*
Moon	*hedecho*	Large man	*mochĭnā dĕăsīra*
Tree	*pachru*	Little man	*mochĭnā zache*
Leaves	*chītŭha*	An iguana	*ipŏga*
House	*dhē*	Lizard	*horhe*
Man	*mochĭna*	Snake	*tamā*
Woman	*wuēna*	Turkey, wild	*zāmo*
Child	*wōrdŏchē*	Parrot	*carre*
Thunder	*pā*	Guacharaca bird	*bulleebullee*
Canoe, or Chingo	*habodrooma*	Guaca bird	*pavŏra*
Tiger, *i.e.* jaguar	*imāmă*	Lazimba	*toosee*

The tide is rising	*tobiroooor*
The tide is falling	*eribudo*
Where are you going	*amonya*
Whence do you come	*zamabima zebuloo*
Let us go	*wonda*
Let us go bathe	*wondo cuide*

The extent to which they differ from the languages of Venezuela and Colombia may be seen from the following tables of the

words common to Dr. Cullen's list, and the equally short ones of the languages of the Orinoco:—

English	*water*	English	*moon*
Cholo	*payto*	Cholo	*hedecho*
Quichua	*unu*	Quichua	*quilla*
Omagua	*uni*	Omagua	*yase*
Salivi	*cagua*	Arawak	*cattehee*
Maypure	*ueru*	Yarura	*goppe*
Ottomaca	*ia*	Betoi	*teo-ro*
Betoi	*ocudù*	Maypure	*chejapi*
Yarura	*uvi*	Salivi	*vexio*
Darien	*dulah*	Darien	*nie*
Carib	*touna*	Zamuca	*ketokhi*
English	*fire*	English	*man*
Cholo	*tŭboor*	Cholo	*mohina*
Quichua	*nina*	Quichua	*ccari*
Omagua	*tata*	——	*runa*
Salivi	*egustà*	Salivi	*cocco*
Maypure	*catti*	Maypure	*cajarrachini*
Ottomaca	*nùa*	——	*mo*
Betoi	*fului*	Ottomaca	*andera*
Yarura	*coride*	Yatura	*pumè*
Carib	*onato*	Muysca	*muysca*
		——	*cha*
English	*sun*	Carib	*oquiri*
Cholo	*pesca*		
Quichua	*inti*	English	*woman*
Omagua	*huarassi*	Cholo	*wuēna*
Salivi	*numesechecoco*	Quichua	*huarmi*
Maypure	*chiè*	Maypure	*tinioki*
Betoi	*teo-umasoi*	Yarura	*ibi*
Yarura	*do*	——	*ain*
Muysca	*suâ*	Betoi	*ro*
Carib	*veiou*	Ottomaca	*ondua*

NOTE.

Exceptions to the statement concerning the New Grenada, the San Salvador, and the Moskito languages will be found in the Notes upon the next paper.

ON THE LANGUAGES OF NORTHERN, WESTERN, AND CENTRAL AMERICA.

READ MAY 9TH. 1856.

The present paper is a supplement to two well-known contributions to America philology by the late A. Gallatin. The first was published in the second volume of the Archæologia Americana, and gives a systematic view of the languages spoken within the *then* boundaries of the United States; these being the River Sabine and the Rocky Mountains, Texas being then Mexican, and, *à fortiori*, New Mexico and California; Oregon, also, being common property between the Americans and ourselves. The second is a commentary, in the second volume of the Transactions of the American Ethnological Society, upon the multifarious mass of philological *data* collected by Mr. Hale, during the United States Exploring Expedition, to which he acted as official and professional philologue; only, however, so far as they applied to the American parts of Oregon. The groups of this latter paper — the paper of the Transactions as opposed to that of the Archæologia — so far as they are separate from those of the former, are —

1. The Kitunaha.
2. The Tsihaili-Selish.
3. The Sahaptin.
4. The Waiilatpu.
5. The Tsinuk or Chinook.
6. The Kalapuya.
7. The Jakon.
8. The Lutuami.
9. The Shasti.
10. The Palaik.
11. The Shoshoni or Snake Indians.

To which add the Arrapaho, a language of Kansas, concerning which information had been obtained since 1828, the date of the first paper. Of course, some of these families extended beyond the frontiers of the United States, so that any notice of them as American carried with it so

much information respecting them to the investigators of the philology of the Canadas, the Hudson's Bay Territory, or Mexico.

Again — three languages, the Eskimo, and Kenai, and Takulli, though not spoken within the limits of the United States, were illustrated. Hence, upon more than one of the groups of the papers in question there still remains something to be said; however much the special and proper subject of the present dissertation may be the languages that lay beyond the pale of Gallatin's researches.

The first groups of tongues thus noticed for the second time are —

I. The Iroquois, and

II. The Sioux. — I have little to say respecting these families except that they appear to belong to some higher class, — a class which, without being raised to any inordinate value, may eventually include not only these two now distinct families, but also the Catawba, Woccoon, Cherokee, Choctah, and (perhaps) Caddo groups, — perhaps also the Pawni and its ally the Riccaree.

III. The Algonkin Group. — The present form of this group differs from that which appears in the Archæologia Americana, by exhibiting larger dimensions. Nothing that was then placed within has since been subtracted from it; indeed, subtractions from any class of Gallatin's making are well-nigh impossible. In respect to additions, the case stands differently.

Addition of no slight importance have been made to the Algonkin group. The earliest was that of —

The Bethuck. — The Bethuck is the native language of Newfoundland. In 1846, the collation of a Bethuck vocabulary enabled me to state that the language of the extinct, or doubtfully extant, aborigines of that island was akin to those of the ordinary American Indians rather than to the Eskimo; further investigation showing that, of the ordinary American languages, it was Algonkin rather than aught else.

A sample of the evidence of this is to be found in the following table; a table formed, not upon the collation of the whole MS., but only upon the more important words contained in it.

English, son.
Bethuck, *mageraguis.*
Cree, *equssis.*
Ojibbeway, *ningwisis* } = my son.
—— *negwis* }
Ottawa, *kwis.*
Micmac, *unquece.*
Passamaquoddy, *n'hos.*
Narragansetts, *nummuckiese* = myson.

Delaware, *quissau* = his son.
Miami, *akwissima.*
——, *ungwissah.*
Shawnoe, *koisso.*
Sack & Fox *neckwessa.*
Menomeni, *nekeesh.*

English, girl.
Bethuck, *woaseesh.*
Cree, *squaisis.*
Ojibbeway, *ekwaizais.*
Ottawa, *aquesens.*
Old Algonkin, *ickwessen.*
Sheshatapoosh, *squashish.*
Passamaquoddy, *pelsquasis.*
Narragansetts, *squasese.*
Montaug, *squasses.*
Sack & Fox, *skwessah.*
Cre, *awâsis* = child.
Sheshatapoosh, *awash* = child.

English, mouth.
Bethuck, *mamadthun.*
Nanticoke, *mettoon.*
Massachusetts, *muttoon.*
Narragansetts, *wuttoon.*
Penobscot, *madoon.*
Acadcan, *meton.*
Micmac, *toon.*
Abenaki, *ootoon.*

English, nose.
Bethuck, *gheen.*
Miami, *keouane.*

English, teeth.
Bethuck, *bocbodza.*
Micmac, *neebeet.*
Abenaki, *neebeet.*

English, hand.
Bethuck, *maemed.*
Micmac, *paeteen.*
Abenaki, *mpateen.*

English, ear.
Bethuck, *mootchiman.*
Micmac, *mootooween.*
Abenaki, *nootawee.*

English, smoke.
Bethuck, *bassdik.*
Abenaki, *ettoodake.*

English, oil.
Bethuck, *emet.*
Micmac, *memaye.*
Abenaki, *pemmee.*

English, sun.
Bethuck, *keuse.*
Cree, &c., *kisis.*
Abenaki, *kesus.*
Mohican, *kesogh.*
Delaware, *gishukh.*
Illinois, *kisipol.*
Shawnoe, *kesathwa.*
Sack & Fox, *kejessoah.*
Menomeni, *kaysho.*
Passamaquoddy, *kisos* = moon.
Abenaki, *kisus* = moon.
Illinois, *kisis* = moon.
Cree, *kesecow* = day.
Ojibbeway, *kijik*=day and light.
Ottawa, *kijik* = ditto.
Abenaki, *kiseoukou* = ditto.
Delaware, *gieshku* = ditto.
Illinois, *kisik* = ditto.
Shawnoe, *keeshqua* = ditto.
Sack & Fox, *keeshekeh* = ditto.

English, fire.
Bethuck, *boobeeshawt.*
Cree, *esquitti*, *scoutay.*
Ojibbeway, *ishkodai*, *skootae.*
Ottawa, *ashkote.*
Old Algonkin, *skootay.*
Sheshatapoosh, *schootay.*
Passamaquoddy, *skeet.*
Abenaki, *skoutai.*
Massachusetts, *squitta.*
Narragansetts, *squtta.*

English, white.
Bethuck, *wobee.*
Cree, *wabisca.*
——, *wapishkawo.*
Ojibbeway, *wawbishkaw.*
——, *wawbizze.*
Old Algonkin, *wabi.*
Sheshatapoosh, *wahpou.*
Micmac, *ouabeg*, *wabeck.*
Mountaineer, *wapsiou.*
Passamaquoddy, *wapiyo.*
Abenaki, *wanbighenour.*
——, *wanbegan.*
Massachusetts, *wompi.*
Narragansetts, *wompesu.*
Mohican, *waupaaeek.*
Montaug, *wampayo.*
Delaware, *wape*, *wapsu*, *wapsit.*
Nanticoke, *wauppauyu.*
Miami, *wapekinggek.*
Shawnoe, *opee.*
Sack & Fox, *wapeskayah.*
Menomeni, *waubish keewah.*

English, black.
Bethuck, *mandzey.*
Ojibbeway, *mukkudaiwa.*
Ottawa, *mackatch.*
Narragansetts, *mowesu.*
Massachusetts, *mooi.*

English, house.
Bethuck, *meeootik.*
Narragansetts, *wetu.*

English, shoe,
Bethuck, *mosen.*
Abenaki, *mkessen.*

English, snow.
Bethuck, *kaasussabook*,
Cree, *sasagun* = hail.
Ojibbeway, *saisaigan.*
Sheshatapoosh, *shashaygan.*

English, speak.
Bethuck, *ieroothack.*
Taculli, *yaltuck.*
Cree, *alhemetakcouse.*
Wyandot, *atakea.*

English, yes.
Bethuck, *yeathun.*
Cree, *ahhah.*
Passamaquoddy, *netek.*

English, no.
Bethuck, *newin.*
Cree, *namaw.*
Ojibbeway, *kawine.*
Ottawa, *kauween.*

English, hatchet.
Bethuck, *dthoonanyen,*
Taculli, *thynle.*

English, knife.
Bethuck, *eewaeen.*
Micmac, *uagan.*

English, bad.
Bethuck, *muddy.*
Cree, *myaton.*
Ojibbeway, *monadud.*
——, *mudji.*
Ottawa, *matche.*
Micmac, *matoualkr.*
Massachusetts, *matche.*
Narragansetts, *matchit.*
Mohican, *matchit.*
Montaug, *mattateayah.*
Montaug, *muttadeeaco.*
Delaware, *makhtitsu.*
Nanticoke, *mattik.*
Sack & Fox, *motchie.*
——, *matchathie.*

The Shyenne. — A second addition of the Algonkin class was that of the Shyenne language — a language suspected to be Algonkin at the publication of the Archæologia Ame-

ricana. In a treaty made between the United States and the Shyenne Indians in 1825, the names of the chiefs who signed were Sioux, or significant in the Sioux language. It was not unreasonable to consider this a *primâ-facie* evidence of the Shyenne tongue itself being Sioux. Nevertheless, there were some decided statements in the way of external evidence in another direction. There was the special evidence of a gentleman well-acquainted with the fact, that the names of the treaty, so significant in the Sioux language, were only translations from the proper Shyenne, there having been no Shyenne interpreter at the drawing-up of the document. What then was the true Shyenne? A vocabulary of Lieut. Abert's settled this. The numerals of this were published earlier than the other words, and on these the present writer remarked that they were Algonkin (Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1847, — Transactions of the Sections, p. 123). Meanwhile, the full vocabulary, which was in the hands of Gallatin, and collated by him, gave the contemplated result: — "Out of forty-seven Shyenne words for which we have equivalents in other languages, there are thirteen which are indubitably Algonkin, and twenty-five which have affinities more or less remote with some of the languages of that family." (Transactions of the American Ethnological Society, vol. ii. p. cxi. 1848.)

The Blackfoot. — In the same volume (p. cxiii), and by the same author, we find a table showing the Blackfoot to be Algonkin; a fact that must now be generally recognized, having been confirmed by later *data*. The probability of this affinity was surmised in a paper in the 28th Number of the Proceedings of the present Society.

The Arrăpaho. — This is the name of a tribe in Kansas; occupant of a district in immediate contact with the Shyenne country.

But the Shyennes are no *indigenæ* to Kansas. Neither are the Arrapahos. The so-called Fall Indians, of whose language we have long had a very short trader's vocabulary in Umfreville, are named from their occupancy which is on the Falls of the Saskatshewan. The Nehethewa, or Crees, of their neighbourhood call them so; so that it is a Cree term of which the English is a translation. Another name (English also) is *Big-belly*, in French *Gros-ventre*. This has given rise to some confusion. *Gros-ventre* is a name also given to the Minetari of the Yellow-stone River; whence the name Minetari itself has, most improperly, been applied

(though not, perhaps, very often or by good authorities) to the Fall Indians.

The Minetari *Gros-ventres* belong to the Sioux family. Not so the *Gros-ventres* of the Falls. Adelung remarked that some of their words had an affinity with the Algonkin, or as he called it, Chippeway-Delaware, family, *e. g.* the names for *tobacco*, *arrow*, *four*, and *ten*.

Umfreville's vocabulary was too short for anything but the most general purposes and the most cautious of suggestions. It was, however, for a long time the only one known. The next to it, in the order of time, was one in MS., belonging to Gallatin, but which was seen by Dr. Prichard and collated by the present writer, his remarks upon it being published in the 134th Number of the Proceedings of this Society. They were simply to the effect that the language had certain miscellaneous affinities. An Arrapaho vocabulary in Schoolcraft tells us something more than this; viz. not only that it is, decidedly, the same language as the Fall Indian of Umfreville, but that it has definite and preponderating affinities with the Shyenne, and, through it, with the great Algonkin class in general.

English.	Arrapaho.	Shyenne.
scalp	mithash	matake.
tongue	nathun	vetunno.
tooth	veathtah	veisike.
beard	vasesanon	meatsa.
hand	mahchetun	maharts.
blood	bahe	mahe.
sinew	anita	antikah.
heart	battah	estah.
mouth	nettee	marthe.
girl	issaha	xsa.
husband	nash	nah.
son	naah	nah.
daughter	nahtahnah	nahtch.
one	chassa	nuke.
two	neis	neguth.
three	nas	nahe.
four	yeane	nave.
five	yorthun	noane.
six	nitahter	nahsato.
seven	nisorter	nisoto.
eight	nahsorter	nahnoto.
nine	siautah	soto.
ten	mahtahtah	mahtoto.

English.	Arrapaho.	Other Algonkin Languages.
man	enanetah	enainneew, *Menom.* &c.
father, my	nasonnah	nosaw, *Miami.*
mother, my	nanah	nekeah, *Menom.*
husband, my	nash	nah, *Shyenne.*
son, my	naah	nah, *Shyenne.*
——	——	nikwi*thah*, *Shawnee.*
daughter, my	nahtahnah	netawnah, *Miami.*
brother, my	nasisthsah	nesawsah, *Miami.*
sister, my	naecahtaiah	nekoshaymank, *Menom.*
Indian	enenitah	ah wainhukai, *Delaware.*
eye	mishishi	maishkayshaik, *Menom.*
mouth	netti	may tone, *Menom.*
tongue	nathun	wilano, *Delaware.*
tooth	veathtah	wi pit, *Delaware.*
beard	vasesanon	witonahi, *Delaware.*
back	nerkorbah	pawkawmema, *Miami.*
hand	machetun	olatshi, *Shawnee.*
foot	nauthauitah	ozit, *Delaware.*
bone	hahunnah	ohkonne, *Menom.*
heart	battah	maytah, *Menom.*
blood	bahe	mainhki, *Menom.*
sinew	anita	ohtah, *Menom.*
flesh	wonnunyah	weensama, *Miami.*
skin	tahyatch	xais, *Delaware.*
town	haitan	otainahe, *Delaware.*
door	tichunwa	kwawntame, *Miami.*
sun	nishi-ish	kayshoh, *Menom.*
star	ahthah	allangwh, *Delaware.*
day	ishi	kishko, *Delaware.*
autumn	tahuni	tahkoxko, *Delaware.*
wind	assissi	kaishxing, *Delaware.*
fire	ishshitta	ishkotawi, *Menom.*
water	nutch	nape, *Miami.*
ice	wahhu	mainquom, *Menom.*
mountain	ahhi	wahchiwi, *Shawnee.*
hot	hastah	ksita, *Shawnee.*
he	enun	enaw, *Miami.*
——	——	waynanh, *Menom.*
that (in)	hinnah	aynaih, *Menom.*
who	unnahah	ahwahnay, *Menom.*
no	chinnani	kawn, *Menom.*
eat	mennisi	mitishin, *Menom.*
drink	bannah	maynaan, *Menom.*
kill	nauaiut	*osh*-nainhnay, *Menom.*

Fitzhugh Sound forms in -SKUM. — There is still a possible addition to the Algonkin group; though it is probable that it cannot be added to it without raising the value of the class. The exact value and interpretation of the following fact has yet to be made out. I lay it, however, before the reader. The language for the parts about Fitzhugh Sound seems to belong to a class which will appear in the sequel under the name Hailtsa or Haeetsuk. The numerals, however, have this peculiarity, viz. they end in the syllable *-kum*. And this is what, in one specimen, at least, two of the Blackfoot terms do.

English, two.	*English*, three.
Fitzhugh Sound, *mal-skum*.	Fitzhugh Sound, *uta-skum*.
Hailtsuk, *maluk*.	Hailtsuk, *yutuk*.
Blackfoot, *nartoke-skum*.	Blackfoot, *nahoke-skum*.

What, however, if this syllable *-skum* be other than true Blackfoot; *i. e.* what if the numerals were taken from the mouth of a *Hailtsa* Indian? The possibility of this must be borne in mind. With this remark upon the similarity of ending between *one specimen* of Blackfoot numerals and the Hailtsa dialect of Fitzhugh Sound, we may take leave of the Algonkin class of tongues and pass on to —

IV. THE ATHABASKAN GROUP. — The vast size of the area over which the Athabaskan tongues have spread themselves, has commanded less attention than it deserves. It should command attention if it were only for the fact of its touching both the Oceans — the Atlantic on the one side, the Pacific on the other. But this is not all. With the exception of the Eskimo, the Athabaskan forms of speech are the most northern of the New World; nay, as the Eskimos are, by no means, universally recognized as American, the Athabaskan area is, in the eyes of many, absolutely and actually the most northern portion of America — the most northern portion of America considered ethnologically or philologically, the Eskimo country being considered Asiatic. To say that the Athabaskan area extends from ocean to ocean, is to say that, as a matter of course, it extends to both sides of the Rocky Mountains. It is also to say that the Athabaskan family is common to both British and Russian America.

For the northern Athabaskans, the main body of the family, the philological details were, until lately, eminently scanty and insufficient. There was, indeed, an imperfect substitute for them in the statements of several highly trustworthy authors as to certain tribes who spoke a language allied to

the Chepewyan, and as to others who did not; — statements which, on the whole, have been shown to be correct; statements, however, which required the confirmation of vocabularies. These have now been procured; if not to the full extent of all the details of the family, to an extent quite sufficient for the purposes of the philologue. They show that the most western branch of the stock, the Chepewyan proper, or the language of what Dobbs called the Northern Indians, is closely akin to that of the Dog-ribs, the Hare (or Slave) and the Beaver Indians, and that the Dahodinni, called from their warlike habits the Mauvais Monde, are but slightly separated from them. Farther west a change takes place, but not one of much importance. Interpreters are understood with greater difficulty, but still understood.

The Sikani and Sussi tongues are known by specimens of considerable length and value, and these languages, lying as far south as the drainage of the Saskatshewan, and as far west as the Rocky Mountains, are, and have been for some years, known as Athabaskan.

Then came the Takulli of New Caledonia, of whose language there was an old sample procured by Harmon. This was the Nagail, or Chin Indian of Mackenzie, or nearly so. Now, *Nagail* I hold to be the same word as *Takull-i*, whilst *Chin* is *Tshin* = *Dinne* = *Tnai* = *Atna* = *Knai* = *Man*. The Takulli division falls into no less than eleven (?) minor sections; all of which but one end in this root, viz. *-tin*.

1. The Tau-*tin*, or Talko-*tin*.

(?) 2. The Tsilko-*tin* or Chilko-*tin*, perhaps the same word in a different dialect.

3. The Nasko-*tin*.
4. The Thetlio-*tin*.
5. The Tsatsno-*tin*.
6. The Nulaau-*tin*.
7. The Ntaauo-*tin*.
8. The Natliau-*tin*.
9. The Nikozliau-*tin*.
10. The Tatshiau-*tin*, and
11. The Babin Indians.

Sir John Richardson, from vocabularies procured by him during his last expedition, the value of which is greatly enhanced by his ethnological chapter on the characteristics of the populations which supplied them, has shown, what was before but suspected, that the Loucheux Indians of Mackenzie River are Athabaskan; a most important addition to our knowledge. Now, the Loucheux are a tribe known under many names; under that of the Quarrellers, under that of the Squinters, under that of the Thycothe and Digothi. Sir John Richardson calls them Kutshin, a name which we shall find in several compounds, just as we found the root *-tin* in the several sections of the Takulli, and as we shall find

its modified form *dinni* among the eastern Athabascans. The particular tribes of the Kutshin division, occupants of either the eastern frontier of Russian America, or the north-western parts of the Hudson's Bay Territory, are (according to the same authority) as follows:

1. The Artez-*kutshi* = Hard people.
2. The Tshu-*kutshi* = Water people.
3. The Tatzei-*kutshi* = Rampart people; falling into four bands.
4. The Teystse-*kutshi* = People of the shelter.
5. The Vanta-*kutshi* = People of the lakes.
6. The Neyetse-*kutshi* = People of the open country.
7. The Tlagga-silla = Little dogs.

Lhis brings us to the *Kenay*. Word for word *Kenay* is *Knai* = *Tnai*, a modified form of the now familiar root *t-n* = *man*, a root which has yet to appear and reappear under various new, and sometimes unfamiliar and unexpected, forms. A Kenay vocabulary has long been known. It appears in Lisiansky tabulated with the Kadiak, Sitkan, and Unalaskan of the Aleutian Islands. It was supplied by the occupants of Cook's Inlet. Were these Athabaskan? The present writer owes to Mr. Isbister the suggestion that they were Loucheux, and to the same authority he was indebted for the use of a very short Loucheux vocabulary. Having compared this with Lisiansky's, he placed both languages in the same category — rightly in respect to the main point, wrongly in respect to a subordinate. He determined the place of the *Loucheux* (*Kutshin* as he would now call them) by that of the Kenay, and made both Kolush. He would now reverse the process and make both Athabaskan, as Sir John Richardson has also suggested.

To proceed — three vocabularies in Baer's *Beiträge* are in the same category with the Kenay, viz. —

1. The *Atna*. — This is our old friend *t-n* again, the form *Tnai* and others occurring. It deserves notice, because, unless noticed, it may create confusion. As more populations than one may call themselves *man*, a word like *Atna* may appear and re-appear as often as there is a dialect which so renders the Latin word *homo*. Hence, there may not only be more *Atnas* than one, but there actually are more than one. This is a point to which we shall again revert. At present it is enough that the Atnas under notice are occupants of the mouth of the Copper River, Indians of Russian America and Athabaskan.

2. The *Koltshani*. — As *t-n* = *man*, so does *k-ltsh* = *stranger*, *guest*, *enemy*, *friend*; and *mūtatis mutandis*, the criticism

that applied to *Atna* applies to words like *Koltshan*, *Golzan*, and *Kolush*. There may be more than one population so called.

3. The *Ugalents* or *Ugalyackh-mutsi*. — This is the name of few families near Mount St. Elias. Now —

The *Atna* at the mouth of the Copper River, the *Koltshani* higher up the stream, and the *Ugalents*, are all held by the present writer to be Athabaskan — not, indeed, so decidedly as the Beaver Indians, the Dog-ribs, or the Proper Chepewyans, but still Athabaskan. They are not Eskimo, though they have Eskimo affinities. They are not Kolush, though they have Kolush affinities. They are by no means isolated, and as little are they to be made into a class by themselves. At the same time, it should be added that by including these *we raise the value of the class.*

For all the languages hitherto mentioned we have specimens. For some, however, of the populations whose names appear in the maps, within the Athabaskan area, we have yet to satisfy ourselves with the testimony of writers, or to rely on inference. In some cases, too, we have the same population under different names. This is the case when we have a native designation as well as a French or English one — *e. g.* Loucheux, Squinters, Kutshin. This, too, is the case when we have, besides the native name (or instead of it), the name by which a tribe is called by its neighbours. Without giving any minute criticism, I will briefly state that all the Indians of the Athabaskan area whose names end in *-dinni* are Athabaskan; viz. —

1. The See-issaw-*dinni* = Rising-sun-*men*.
2. The Tau-tsawot-*dinni* = Birch-rind-*men*.
3. The Thlingeha-*dinni* = Dog-rib-*men*.
4. The Etsh-tawút-*dinni* = Thickwood-*men*.
5. The Ambah tawút-*dinni* = Mountain-sheep-*men*.
6. The Tsillaw-awdút-*dinni* = Bushwood-*men*.

Lastly — Carries, Slave-Indians, Yellow-knives, Copper-Indians, and Strong-bows are synonyms for some of the tribes already mentioned. The *Hare*-Indians are called *Kancho*. The Nehanni and some other populations of less importance are also, to almost a certainly, Athabaskan with the tongues in its neighbourhood, we shall find that it is broadly and definitely separated from them in proportion as we move from west to east. In Russian America, the Eskimo, Sitkan, and Athabaskan tongues graduate into each other. In the same parts the Athabaskan forms of speech differ most from each other. On the other hand, to the east of the Rocky Mountains, the Dog-ribs, the Hares, and the

Chepewy ans are cut off by lines equally trenchant from the Eskimos to the north, and from the Algonkins to the south. I infer from this that the diffusion of the language over those parts is comparatively recent; in other words, that the Athabaskan family has moved from west to east rather than from east to west.

Of the proper Athabaskan, *i. e.* of the Athabaskan in the original sense of the word, the southern boundary, beginning at Fort Churchill, on Hudson's Bay, follows (there or thereabouts) the course of the Missinippi; to the north of which lie the Chepewyans who are Athabaskan, to the south of which lie the Crees, or Knistenaux, who are Algonkin. Westward come the Blackfeet (Algonkin) and the Sussees (Athabaskan), the former to the north, the latter to the south, until the Rocky Mountains are reached. The Takulli succeed — occupants of New Caledonia; to the south of whom lie Kutani and Atnas. The Takulli area nowhere touches the ocean, from which its western frontier is separated to the south of 55° north latitude by some unplaced languages; to the north of 55°, by the Sitkeen — but only as far as the Rocky Mountains; unless, indeed, some faint Algonkin characteristics lead future inquirers to extend the Algonkin area westwards, which is not improbable. The value of the class, however, if this be done, will have to be raised.

The most southern of the Athabaskans are the Sussees, in north latitude 51°—there or thereabouts. But the Sussees, far south as they lie, are only the most southern Athabaskans *en masse*. There are outliers of the stock as far south as the southern parts of Oregon. More than this, there are Athabaskans in California, New Mexico, and Sonora.

Few discoveries respecting the distribution of languages are more interesting than one made by Mr. Hale, to the effect that the Umkwa, Kwaliokwa, and Tlatskanai dialects of a district so far south as the River Columbia, and the upper portion of the Umkwa river (further south still) were outlying members of the Athabaskan stock, a stock preeminently northern—not to say Arctic—in its main area.

Yet the dialects just named were shown by a subsequent discovery of Professor Turner's, to be only penultimate ramifications of their stock; inasmuch as further south and further south still, in California, New Mexico, Sonora, and even Chihuhua, as far south as 30° north latitude, Athabaskan forms of speech were to be found; the Navaho of Uta and New Mexico, the Jecorilla of New Mexico, and the Apatch of New Mexico, California, and Sonora, being Athabaskan. The Hoopah of California is also Athabaskan.

The first of the populations to the south of the Athabaskan area, who, lying on, or to the west of, the Rocky Mountains, are other than Algonkin, are—

V. The Kitunaha.—The Kitunaha, Cutani, Cootanie or Flatbow area is long rather than broad, and it follows the line of the Rocky Mountains between 52° and 48° north latitude. How definitely it is devided by the main ridge from that of the Blackfoots I am unable to say, but as a general rule, the Kutani lie west, the Blackfoots east; the former being Indians of New Caledonia and Oregon, the latter of the Hudson's Bay Territory and the United States. On the west the Kutani country is bounded by that of the Shushap and Selish Atnas, on the north by the Sussee, Sikanni, and Nagail Athabaskans, on the south (I think) by some of the Upsaroka or Crow tribes. All these relations are remarkable, and so is the geographical position of the area. It is in a mountain-range; and, as such, in a district likely to be an ancient occupancy. The languages with which the Kutani lies in contact are referable to four different families — the Athabaskan, the Atna, the Algonkin, and the Sioux; the last two of which, the Blackfoot (Algonkin) and the Crow (Sioux), are both extreme forms, *i. e.* forms sufficiently unlike the other members of these respective groups to have had their true position long overlooked; forms, too, sufficiently peculiar to justify the philologue in raising them to the rank of separate divisions. It suffices, however, for the present to say, that the Kutani language is bounded by four tongues differing in respect to the class to which they belong and from each other, and different from the Kutani itself.

The Kutani, then, differs notably from the tongues with which it is in geographical contact; though, like all the languages of America, it has numerous miscellaneous affinities. In respect to its phonesis it agrees with the North Oregon languages. The similarity in name to the Loucheux, whom Richardson calls *Kutshin*, deserves notice. Upon the whole, few languages deserve attention more than the one under notice.

VI. The Atna Group.—West of the Kutanis and south of the Takulli Athabaskans lie the northernmost members of a great family which extends as far south as the Sahaptin frontier, the Sahaptin being a family of Southern, or American, Oregon. Such being the case, the great group now under notice came under the cognizance of the two American philologues, whose important labours have already been noticed, by whom it has been denominated Tsihaili-Selish. It contains the Shushwap, Selish, Skitsnish (or Cœur

d'Alene) Piskwans, Nusdalum, Kawitchen, Skwali, Chechili, Kowelits, and Nsietshawus forms of speech.

In regard to the Atna I have a statement of my own to correct, or at any rate to modify. In a paper, read before the Ethnological Society, on the Languages of the Oregon Territory (Dec. 11, 1844), I pronounced that an Atna vocabulary found in Mackenzie's Travels, though different from the Atna of the Copper River, belonged to the same group. The *group*, however, to which the Atna of the Copper River belongs is the Athabaskan.

The Tsihaili-Selish languages reach the sea in the parts to the south of the mouth of Frazer's River, *i. e.* the parts opposite Vancouver's Island; perhaps they touch it further to the north also; perhaps, too, some of the Takulli forms of the speech further north still reach the sea. The current statements, however, are to the effect, that to the south of the parts opposite Sitka, and to the north of the parts opposite Vancouver's Island, the two families in question are separated from the Pacific by a narrow strip of separate language — separate and but imperfectly known. These are, beginning from the north —

VII. The Haidah Group of Languages. — Spoken by the Skittegats, Massetts, Kumshahas, and Kyganie of Queen Charlotte's Islands and the Prince of Wales Archipelago. Its area lies immediately to that of the south of the so-called Kolush languages.

VIII. The Chemmesyan. — Spoken along the sea-coast and islands of north latitude 55°.

IX. The Billechula. — Spoken at the mouth of Salmon River; a language to which I have shown, elsewhere, that a vocabulary from Mackenzie's Travels of the dialect spoken at Friendly Village was referable.

X. The Hailtsa. — The Hailtsa contains the dialects of the sea-coast between Hawkesbury Island and Broughton's Archipelago, also those of the northern part of Vancouver's Island.

In Gallatin, the Chemmesyan, Billechula, and Hailtsa are all thrown in a group called *Naas*. The Billechula numerals are, certainly, the same as the Hailtsa; the remainder of the vocabulary being unlike, though not altogether destitute of coincidences. The Chemmesyan is more outlying still. I do not, however, in thus separating these three languages, absolutely deny the validity of the *Naas* family. I only imagine that if it really contain languages so different as the Chemmesyan and Hailtsa, it may also certain the Haidah and other groups, *e. g.* the one that comes next, or —

XI. THE WAKASH of Quadra and Vancouver's Island.

South of the Wakash area come, over and above the southern members of the Atna family and the Oregon outliers of the Athabaskan, the following groups, of value hitherto unascertained.

A. The Tshinuk, or Chinuk;

B. The Kalapuya;

C. The Jakon; — all agreeing in the harshness of their phonesis, and (so doing) contrasted with —

D. The Sahaptin, and

E. The Shoshoni.

The Sahaptin is separated by Gallatin from the Waiilatpu containing the Cayús or Molelé form of speech. The present writer throws them both into the same group. The numerals, the words wherein it must be admitted that the two languages agree the most closely, are in —

ENGLISH.	SAHAPTIN.	CAYÚS.
one	naks	ná.
two	lapit	lepl-in.
three	mitat	mat-nin.
six	oi-lak	noi-na.
seven	oi-napt	noi-lip.
eight	oi-matat	noi-mat.

The meaning of the *oi* and *noi* in these words requires investigation. It is not *five;* the Sahaptin and Cayús for *five* being *pakhat* (S.) and *tawit* (C.). Nor yet is it *hand* (as the word for *five* often is), the word for *hand* being *epih* and *apah*. It ought, however, theoretically to be something of the kind, inasmuch as

Oi-lak and *noi*-na = ? + 1.
Oi-napt and *noi*-lip = ? + 2.
Oi-matat and *noi*-mat = ? + 3.

Of the Shoshoni more will be said in the sequel. At present it is enough to state that the Shoshoni and Sahaptin languages are as remarkable for the apparent ease and simplicity of their phonesis as the Jakon, Kalapuya, and Tshinúk are for the opposite qualities. It may also be added that the Shoshoni tongues will often be called by the more general name of Paduca.

South of the Cayús, Waiilatpu, and Wihinast, or Western Shoshonis, come the languages which are common to Oregon and

CALIFORNIA.

For three of these we have vocahularies (Mr. Hale's): —

I. (*a.*) THE LUTUMANI; (*b.*) THE PALAIK; (*c.*) THE SHASTI. — There may be other forms of speech common to the two countries, but these three are the only ones known to us by specimens. The Lutuami, Shasti, and Palaik are thrown by Gallatin into three separate classes. They are, without doubt, mutually unintelligible. Nevertheless they cannot be very widely separated.

Man = in Lutuami *hishu-atsus*, in Palaik = *yatui*. Qu. *atsus* = *yatui*.

Woman = Lutuami *tar-itsi*, Palaik = *umtew-itsen*. Qu. *itsi* = *itsen*. In Palaik, *Son* = *yau-itsa*, *Daughter* = *lumau-itsa*.

Head = Palaik *lah*. In Lutuomi *lak* = *hair*. Qu. *mak* = *head* in Shasti, *makh* = *hair*, Shasti.

Ear = Lutuami *mumoutsh*, Palaik *ku-mumuats*.

Mouth = *au* Shasti, *ap* Palaik.

Tooth = *itsau* Shasti, *itsi* Palaik.

Sun = *tsoare* Shasti, *tsul* Palaik = *sun* and *moon*. In Lutuami *tsol* = *star*.

Fire = Shasti *ima* = Palaik *malis*. The termination *-l-* common in Palaik, — *ipili* = *tongue*, *kelala* = *shoes*, *uschela* = *sky*, &c.

Water = Shasti *atsa*, Palaik *as*.

Snow = Lutuami *kais*, Shasti *kae*.

Earth = Lutuami *kaela*, Palaik *kela*, Shasti *tarak*. This is the second time we have had a Shasti *r* for a Palaik *l* — *tsoare* = *tsul*.

Bear = *tokunks* Lutuami, *lokhoa*, Palaik.

Bird = Lutuami *lalak*, Shasti *tararakh*.

I = Lutuami *no*. Qu. is this the *n* in *n-as* = *head* and *n-ap* = for which latter word the Shasti is *ap-ka?*

NUMERALS.

ENGLISH.	SHASTI.	PALAIK.
one	tshiamu	umis.
two	hoka	kaki.

Neither are there wanting affinities to the Sahaptin and Cayús languages, allied to each other. Thus —

Ear = *mumutsh* Lutuami = *ku-mumuats* Palaik = *mutsaui* Sahaptin. *tsack* Shasti = *taksh* Cayús.

Mouth = *shum* Lutuami = *shum-kaksh* Cayús = *him* Sahaptin.

Tongue = *pawus* Lutuami = *pawish* Sahaptin = *push* Cayús.

Tooth = *tut* Lutuami = *til* Sahaptin.

Foot = *akwes* Shasti = *akhua* Sahaptin.

Blood = *ahati* Palaik = *kiket* Sahaptin.

Fire = *loloks* Lutuami = *ihiksha* Sahaptin.

One = *natshik* Lutuami = *naks* Sahaptin = *na* Cayús.

Two = *lapit* Lutuami = *lapit* Sahaptin = *leptin* Cayús.

The Lutuami seems somewhat the most Sahaptin of the three, and this is what we expect from its geographical position, it being conterminous with the Molelé (or Cayús) and the allied Waiilatpu. It is also conterminous with the Wihinast Shoshoni, or Paduca, as is the Palaik. Both Palaik and Lutuami (along with the Shasti) have Shoshoni affinities.

English.	Shoshoni.
nose	moui = iami, *Palaik.*
mouth	timpa = shum, *Lutuami.*
ear	inaka = isak, *Shasti.*
sun	tava = sapas, *Lutuami.*
water	pa = ampo, *Lutuami.*
I	ni = no, *Lutuami.*
thou	i = i, *Lutuami.*
he	oo = hot, *Lutuami.*
one	shimutsi = *tshiamuu*, Shasti; *umis*, Palaik.

The chief language in contact with the Shasti is the intrusive Athabaskan of the Umkwa and Tlatskanai tribes. Hence the nearest languages with which it should be compared are the Jakon and Kalapuya, from which it is geographically separated. For this reason we do not expect any great amount of coincidence. We find however the following —

English.	Jakon.
head	tkhlokia = lah, *Palaik.*
star	tkhlalt = tshol, *Lutuami.*
night	kache = apkha, *Shasti.*
blood	pouts = poits, *Lutuami.*
one	khum = tshiamu, *Palaik.*

Of three languages spoken in the north of California and mentioned in Schoolcraft, by name, though not given in specimens, — (1) the Watsahewa, (2) the Howtetech, and (3) the Nabiltse, — the first is said to be that of the Shasti bands;

Of the Howtetech I can say nothing;

The Nabiltse is, probably, the language of the Tototune; at least Rogue's River is its locality, and the Rascal Indians is an English name for the Tototune.

South of the Shasti and Lutuami areas we find —

II. The Ehnik.

III. The Tahlewah.

The latter vocabulary is short, and taken from a *Scragoin*

Indian, *i. e.* from an Indian to whom it was not the native tongue. We are warned of this — the inference being that the Tahlewah vocabulary is less trustworthy than the others.

English.	Ehnek.	Tahlewah.
man	ahwunsh	pohlusan'h.
boy	anak'hocha	kerrhn.
girl	yehnipahoitch	kerníhl.
Indian	ahrah	astowah.
head	akhoutshhoutsh	astintah.
beard	merruhw	semerrhperrh.
neck	sihn	schoniti.
face	ahve	wetawaluh.
tongue	upri	so'h.
teeth	wu'h	shtí.
foot	fissi	stah.
one	issah	titskoh.
two	achhok	kitchnik.
three	keurakh	kltchnah.
four	peehs	tshahanik.
five	tirahho	schwallah.
ten	trah	swellah.

The junction of the Rivers Klamatl and Trinity gives us the locality for —

IV. The Languages akin to the Weitspek. — The Weitspek itself is spoken at the junction, but its dialects of the Weyot and Wishosk extend far into Humboldt County, where they are, probably, the prevailing forms of speech, being used on the Mad River, and the parts about Cape Mendocino.

The Weyot and Wishosk are mere dialects of the same language. From the Weitspek they differ much more than they do from each other. It is in the names of the parts of the body where the chief resemblances lie.

V. The Mendocino (?) Group. — This is the neme suggested for the *Choweshak*, *Batemdaikai*, *Kulanapo*, *Yukai*, and *Khwaklamayu* forms of speech collectively.

1, 2. The Choweshak and Batemdaikai are spoken on Eel River, and in the direction of the southern branches of the Weitspek group, with which they have affinities.

3, 4, 5. The *Kulanapo* is spoken about Clear Lake, the *Yukai* on Russian River. These forms of speech, closely allied to each other, are also allied to the so-called Northern Indians of Baer's Beiträge, Northern meaning to the north of the settlement of Ross. The particular tribe of which we have a vocabulary called themselves *Khwakhlamayu*.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY

English.	Khwakhlamayu.	Kulanapo.
head	khommo	kaiyah.
hair	shuka	musuh.
eye	iiu	ui.
ear	shuma	shimah.
nose	pla	labahbo.
mouth	aa	katsideh.
tooth	oo	yaoh.
tongue	aba	bal.
hand	psba	biyah.
foot	sakki	kahmah.
sun	ada	lah.

English.	Weitspek.	Kulanapo.
moon	kalazha	luelah.
star	kamoi	uiyahhoh.
fire	okho	k'hoh.
water	aka	k'hah.
one	ku	khahlih.
two	koo	kots.
three	subo	homeka.
four	mura	dol.
five	tysha	lehmah.
six	lara	tsadi.

The following shows the difference between the Weitspek and Kulanapo; one belonging to the northern, the other to the southern division of their respective groups.

English.	Weitspek.	Kulanapo.
man	pagehk	kaah.
woman	wintsuk	dah.
boy	hohksh	kahwih.
girl	wai inuksh	dahhats.
head	tegueh	kaiyah.
hair	leptaitl	musuh.
ear	spèhguh	shímah.
eye	mylih	ni.
nose	metpí	labahbo.
mouth	mihlutl	katsédeh.
tongue	mehpl'h	bal.
teeth	merpetl	yaóh.
beard	mehperch	katsutsu.
arm	mehsheh'	tsuah.
hand	tsewush	biyyah.
foot	metské	kahmah.
blood	happ'l	bahlaik.

English.	Weitspek.	Kulanapo.
sun	wánoushleh	lah.
moon	ketnewahr	luĕlah.
star	haugets	uiyahoh.
day	tehnep	dahmul.
dark	ketutski	petih.
fire	mets	k'hoh.
water	paha	k'hah.
I	nek	hah.
thou	kehl	ma.
one	spinekoh	k'hahlih.
two	nuehr	kots.
three	naksa	homeka.
four	tohhunne	dol.
five	mahrotum	lehmah.
six	hohtcho	tsadi.
seven	tchewurr	kulahots.
eight	k'hehwuh	kokodohl.
nine	kerr	hadarolshum.
ten	wert'hlehwerh	hadorutlek.

In the *Kulanapo* language *yacal ma napo = all the cities.* Here *napo = Napa*, the name of one of the counties to the north of the Bay of San Francisco and to the south of Clear Lake.

We may now turn to the drainage of the Sacramento and the parts south of the Shasti area. Here we shall find three vocabularies, of which the chief is called —

VI. The Copeh. — How far this will eventually turn out to be a convenient name for the group (or how far the group itself will be real), is uncertain. A vocabulary in Gallatin from the Upper Sacramento, and one from Mag Readings (in the south of Shasti county) in Schoolcraft, belong to the group.

Mag Readings is on the upper third of the Sacramento — there or thereabouts.

English.	Copeh.	M. R. Indian.	U. Sacr.
man	pehtluk	winnoke	——
woman	muhlteh	dokke	——
head	buhk	pok	——
hair	tiih	tomi	tomoi.
eye	sah	chuti	tumut.
nose	kiunik	——	tsono.
mouth	kohl	——	kal.
teeth	siih	shi	——
beard	chehsaki	khetcheki	——

English.	Copeh.	M. R. Indian.	U. Sacr.
arm	sahlah	——	keole,
hand	semh	shim	tsemut (*fingers*).
foot	mai'h	mat	ktamoso.
blood	sahk	chedik	——
sun	sunh	tuku	sas.
wind	toudi	kleyhi	——
rain	yohro	luhollo	——
snow	yohl	yola	——
fire	poh	pau	po.
water	mehm	mem	mem.
earth	kirrh	kosh	——

In the paper of No. 134 the import of a slight amount of likenes between the Upper Sacramento vocabulary and the Jakon is overvalued. The real preponderance of the affinities of the group taken in mass is that which its geographical position induces us to expect *à priori*. With the Shasti, &c. the Copeh has the following words in common: —

English.	Copeh.	Shasti, etc.
head	buhk	uiak, S.
hair	teih	tiyi, P.
teeth	siih	itsa, P.
ear	maht	*mu*-mutsh, L.
eye	sah	asu, P.
foot	mat	pats, L.
sun	sunh	tsul, P.
thou	mih	mai, S.

and, probably, others.

The Copeh is spoken at the head of Putos Creek.

Observe that the Copeh for *water* is *mem*, as it is in the languages of the next group, which we may provisionally call —

VII. The Pujuni. — Concerning this we have a notice in Hale, based upon information given by Captain Suter to Mr. Dana. It was to the effect that, about eighty or a hundred miles from its mouth, the river Sacramento formed a division between two languages, one using *momi*, the other *kik* = *water*.

The Pujuni, &c. say *momi;* as did the speakers of the Copeh.

For the group we have the (*a*) Pujuni, (*b*) Secumne, and (*c*) Tsamak specimens of Hale, as also the Cushna vocabulary, from the county Yuba, of Schoolcraft; the Cushna numerals, as well as other words, being nearly the same as the Secumne, *e. g.*

English.	Secumne.	Cushna.
one	wikte	wikte-*m*.
two	pen	pani-*m*.
three	sapui	sapui-*m*.
four	tsi	tsui-*m*.
five	mauk	marku-*m* (mahkum?).

So are several other words besides, as —

head	tsol	chole.
hair	ono	ono.
ear	bono'	bono.
eye	il	hin.
sun	oko	okpi.

VIII. The Moquelumne Group. — Hale's vocabulary of the Talatui belongs to the group for which the name *Moquelumne* is proposed, a Moquelumne Hill (in Calaveras county) and a Moquelumne River being found within the area over which the languages belonging to it are spoken. Again, the names of the tribes that speak them end largely in *-mne*, — *Chupumne*, &c. As far south as Tuol-*umne* county the language belongs to this division, as may be seen from the following table; the Talatui being from Hale, the Tuolumne from Schoolcraft; the Tuolumne Indians being on the Tuolumne River, and Cornelius being their great chief, with six subordinates under him, each at the head of a different ranchora containing from fifty to two hundred individuals. Of these six members of what we may call the Cornelian captaincy, five speak the language represented by the vocabulary: viz.

1. The Mumaltachi.
2. The Mullateco.
3. The Apangasi.
4. The Lapappu.
5. The Siyante or Typoxi.

The sixth band is that of the Aplaches (? Apaches), under Hawhaw, residing further in the mountains.

English.	Tuolumne.	Talatui.
head	hownah	tiket.
hair	esok	munu.
ear	tolko	alok.
eye	húntch	wilai
nose	níto	uk (?).
mouth	ahwúk	hubo (?).
sky	wutsha	witçuk.

English.	Tuolumne.	Talatui.
sun	heamhah	hi.
day	hemaah	hiúmu.
night	kowwillah	kawil.
darkness	pozattah	hunaba.
fire	wúkah	wike.
water	kíkah	kík.
stone	lowwak	sawa.

As far west as the sea-coast languages of the Moquelumne group are spoken. Thus —

A short vocabulary of the San Rafael is Moquelumne.

So are the Sonoma dialects, as represented by the Tshokoyem vocabulary and the Chocouyem and Yonkiousme Paternosters.

So is the *Olamentke* of Kostromitonov in Baer's Beiträge.

So much for the forms of speech to the north of the Gulf of San Francisco. On the south the philology is somewhat more obscure. The Paternosters for the *Mission de Santa Clara* and the *Vallee de los Tulares* of Mofras seem to belong to the same language. Then there is, in the same author, one of the *Langue Guiloco de la Mission de San Francisco.* These I make Moquelumne provisionally. I also make a provisional division for a vocabulary called —

IX. The Costano. — The tribes under the supervision of the Mission of Dolores were five in number; the Ahwastes, the Olhones, or Costanos of the coast, the Romonans, the Tulomos, and the Altatmos. The vocabulary of which the following is an extract was taken from Pedro Alcantara, who was a boy when the Mission was founded, A. D. 1776. He was of the Romonan tribe.

English.	Costano.	Tshokoyem.
man	imhen	tai-*esse.*
woman	ratichma	kuleh-*esse.*
boy	shínísmuk	yokeh (*small*)
girl	katra	koyah.
head	úlc	moloh.
ear	tuorus	ahlohk.
eye	rchin	shut.
nose	ús	huk.
mouth	werper	lapgup.
tongue	tassek	lehntip.
tooth	síít	kuht.
neck	lani	helekke.
foot	kolo	koyok.

English.	Costano.	Tshokoyem.
blood	payan	kichawh.
sky	reneme	lihlih.
sun	ishmen	hih.
moon	kolma	pululuk.
star	agweh	hittish.
day	puhe (*light*)	hiahnah.
night	moor (*dark*)	kawul.
fire	roretaon	wikih.
water	sii	kihk.
river	orush	polah.
stone	erek	lepeh.
I	kahnah	kahni.
thou	mene	mih.
he	wahche	ikkoh.
they	nekumsah	mukkam.
all	kete	mukkam.
who	mato	mahnti.
eat	ahmush	yohlomusih.
drink	owahto	ushu.
run	akamtoha	hihchiah.
see	atempimah	ellih.

This shows that it differs notably from the Tshokoyem; the personal pronouns, however, being alike. Again, the word for *man* = *l-aman-tiya* in the San Rafael. On the other hand, it has certain Cushna affinities.

Upon the whole, however, the affinities seem to run in the direction of the languages of the next group, especially in that of the Ruslen: —

I = *kah-nah*, Cost. = *ka* = *mine*, Ruslen.
Thou = *me-ne*, Cost. = *mé* = *thine*, Ruslen.
Sun = *ishmen*, Cost. = *ishmen* = *light*, Ruslen.
Water = *sii*, Cost. = *ziy*, Ruslen.
(?) Boy = *shinishmuk*, Cost. = *enshinsh*, Ruslen.
(?) Girl = *katra*, Cost. = *kaana*, Ruslen.

Lest these last three coincidences seem far-fetched, it should be remembered that the phonesis in these languages is very difficult, and that the Ruslen orthography is Spanish, the Costano being English. Add to this, there is every appearance, in the San Miguel and other vocabularies, of the *r* being something more than the *r* in *brand*, &c. every appearance of its being some guttural or palatal, which may, by a variation of orthography, be spelt by *l*.

Finally, I remark that the *-ma* in the Costano *ratich-ma*

= *woman*, is, probably, the *-me* in the Soledad *mue* (= *man*) and *shurish-me* (= *woman*), and the *amk* (*ank*) of the Ruslen *muguy-amk* (= *man*) and *latrayam-ank* (= *woman*); (?) *latraya* = *ratich*. Nevertheless, for the present I place the Costano by itself, as a transitional form of speech to the languages spoken north, east, and south of the Bay of San Francisco.

X. The Mariposa Languages. — In the north of Mariposa county, and not far south of the Tuolumne area, the language seems changed, and the *Coconoons* is spoken by some bands on the Mercede River, under a chief named Nuella. They are said to be the remnants of three distinct bands each, with its own distinct language.

English.	Coconoons.	Tulare.
head	oto	utno.
hair	tolus	celis.
ear	took	took.
nose	thedick	tuneck.
mouth	sammack	shemmak.
tongue	talcotch	talkat.
tooth	talee	talee.
sun	suyou	oop.
moon	offaum	taahmemna.
star	tchietas	sahel.
day	hial	tahoh *.
fire	sottol	ossel.
water	illeck	illick.

XI. The Salinas Group. — This is a name which I propose for a group of considerable compass; and one which contains more than one mutually unintelligible form of speech. It is taken from the river Salinas, the drainage of which lies in the counties of Monterey and San Luis Obispo. The southern boundary of Santa Cruz lies but a little to the north of its mouth.

The Gioloco may possibly belong to this group, notwithstanding its reference to the Mission of San Francisco. The *alla*, and *mut-* (in *mut*-ryocusé), may = the *ahay* and *i-mit-a* (*sky*) of the Eslen.

The Ruslen has already been mentioned, and that in respect to its relations to the Costano. It belongs to this group.

So does the Soledad of *Mofras;* which, though it differs from that of Hale in the last half of the numerals, seems to represent the same language.

---

* Same word as *taech*=*light* in Coconoons; in Pima *tai*.

So do the Eslen and Carmel forms of speech; allied to one another somewhat more closely than to the Ruslen and Soledad.

So do the San Antonio and San Miguel forms of speech.

The Ruslen, Eslen, San Antonio and San Miguel are, probably, four mutually unintelligible languages.

The Salinas languages are succeeded to the south by the forms of speech of —

XII. The Santa Barbara Group — containing the Santa Barbara, Santa Inez, and San Luis *Obispo* languages.

XIII. The Capistrano Group. — Capistrano is a name suggested by that of the Mission of San Juan Capistrano. The group, I think, falls into two divisions: —

1. *The Proper Capistrano, or Netela*, of San Luis *Rey* and San Juan Capistrano.

2. *The San Gabriel, or Kij*, of San Gabriel and San Fernando.

XIV. The Yuma languages. — At the junction of the Gila and Colorado stands Fort Yuma, in the district of the Yuma Indians. They occupy each side of the Colorado, both above and below its junction with the Gila. How far they extend northwards is unknown, probably more than 100 miles. They are also called *Cuchans*, and are a fierce predatory nation, encroaching equally on tribes of their own language and on aliens.

From these *Yuma* Indians I take the name for the group now under notice. It contains, besides the Yuma Proper, the Dieguno of San Diego and the Coco-maricopa.

The Coco-maricopa Indians are joint-occupants of certain villages on the Gila; the population with which they are associated being *Pima*. Alike in other respects, the Pima and Coco-maricopa Indians differ in language, as may be seen from the following table, confirmatory of the testimony of numerous trustworthy authorities to the same effect.

English.	Pima.	Cuchan.	Cocomaricopa.	Dieguno.
man	huth	epatsh	apatch	àyeutcht. epatch.
woman	hahri	sinyak	seniact	sun.
Indian	huup	metepaie	——	——
head	mouk	ecoutsucherowo and umwelthoocouo	——	estar.
hair	ptmuk	eetche	——	hiletar.
ear	ptnahauk	smythl	——	——
nose	tahnk	——	——	hu.
mouth	chinits	——	——	ah.

English.	Pima.	Cuchan.	Cocomaricopa.	Dieguno.
tongue	neuen	epulche	—	—
tooth	ptahan	aredoche	—	—
beard	chinyo	yahboinch	—	—
hand	mahahtk	eesalche	issalis	selh.
foot	tetaght	emetchslipaslapya	ametche	hamulyay.
sky	ptchuwik	amma	—	—
sun	tahs	nyatch	—	—
moon	mahsa	huthlya	—	—
star	uon	klupwalaie	—	—
snow	chiah	halup	—	—
fire	tahi	aawoh	house	—
water	suntik	aha	haache	kha.
I	ahan	nyat	—	nyah.
he	yeutah	habritzk	—	—
one	yumako	sin	sandek	hina.
two	kuak	havick	haveka	hawue.
three	vaik	hamuk	hamoka	hamuk.
four	kiik	chapop	champapa	chapop.
five	puitas	serap	sarap	suap.

San Diego lies in $32^1/_2{}^0$ north latitude, a point at which the philology diverges — in one direction into Old California, in another into Sonora. I first follow it in the direction of

Old California.

San Diego, as has just been stated, lies in $32^1/_2{}^0$ north latitude. Now it is stated in the Mithridates that the most northern of the Proper *Old* Californian tongues, the *Cochimi,* is spoken as far north as 33^0. If so, the Dieguno may be *Old* Californian as well as *New;* which I think it is; believing, at the same time, that *Cochimi* and *Cuchan* are the same words. Again, in the following Paternoster the word for *sky* = *ammai* in the Cuchan vocabulary.

Cochimi of San Xavier.

father *sky*
Pennayu makẹnambà yaa ambayujui miyà mo;
name *men* *confess* *and* *love* *all*
Buhu mombojua tamma gkomendà hi nogodoño demuejueg gkajim;
and *sky* *earth*
Pennayùla bogodoño gkajim, gui hi ambayujup maba yaa kẹamete
favour
decuinyi mo puegiñ;

sky *earth*
Yaa m blihula mujua ambayup mo dedahijua, amet ê nò gùlugui hi pagkajim;
this day *day*
Tamadà yaa ibo tejueg quiluguiqui pemijich ê mòu ibo yanno puegiñ;
and man *evil*
Guihi tamma yaa gambuegjula kepujui ambinyijua pemayala dedaudugùjua, giulugui pagkajim;
and *although* *and*
Guihi yaa tagamuegla hui ambinyijua hi doomo puhuegjua, he doomo pogonunyim;
and *earth* *bless*
Tagamuegjua guihi usimahel keammet è decuinyimo, guihi yaa *evil*
hui ambinyi yaa gambuegpea pagkaudugum.

Lastly, in 33° north latitude, the language of* San Luis El *Rey*, which is Yuma, is succeeded by that of San Luis *Obispo*, which is Capistrano.

I conclude, then, that the Yuma language belongs to the southern parts of *New* and the northern part of *Old* California.

Of recent notices of any of the languages of Old California, *eo nomine*, I know none. In the Mithridates the information is pre-eminently scanty.

According to the only work which I have examined at first-hand, the *Nachrichten von der Americanischen Halbinsel Californien* (Mannheim, 1772; in the Mithridates, 1773), the anonymous author of which was a Jesuit missionary in the middle parts of the Peninsula, the languages of Old California were —

1. The *Waikur*, spoken in several dialects.
2. The *Ushiti*.
3. The *Layamon*
4. The *Cochimi*, north, and
5. The *Pericu*, at the southern extremity of the peninsula.
6. A probably new form of speech used by some tribes visited by Linck.

This is what we learn from what we call the Mannheim account; the way in which the author expresses himself being not exactly in the form just exhibited, but to the effect that, besides the Waikur with its dialects, there were five others.

The Waikur Proper, the language which the author under

* For an exception to this statement see the Remarks at the end of the Volume. (1859.)

notice was most especially engaged on, and which he says that he knew sufficiently for his purposes as a missionary, is the language of the middle part of the peninsula. How far the Utshiti, and Layamon were dialects of it, how farthey were separate substantive languages, is not very clearly expressed. The writer had Utshis, and Utshipujes, and Atschimes in his mission, "thoroughly distinct tribes — *lauter verschiedene Völcklein.*" Nevertheless he always speaks as if the Waikur tongue was sufficient for his purposes. On the other hand, the Utshiti is especially mentioned as a separate language. Adelung makes it a form of the Waikur; as he does the Layamon, and also the Cora and Aripe. Then there comes a population called *Ika*, probably the Picos or Ficos of Bagert, another authority for these parts. Are these, the sixth population of the Mannheim account, the unknown tribes visited by Linck? I think not. They are mentioned in another part of the book as *known*.

To the names already mentioned

1. Ika,
2. Utshi,
3. Utshipuje,
4. Atschime,

add

5. Paurus,
6. Teakwas,
7. Teengúabebes,
8. Angukwares,
9. Mitsheriku-tamais,
10. Mitsheriku-tearus
11. Mitsheriku-ruanajeres,

and you have a list of the tribes with which a missionary for those parts of California where the Waikur languages prevailed, came in contact. Altogether they gave no more than some 500 individuals, so miserably scanty was the population.

The occupancies of these lay chiefly within the Cochimi area, which reached as far south as the parts about Loretto in 26° north latitude; the Loretto language being the Layamon. This at least is the inference from the very short table of the Mithridates, which, however little it may tell us in other respects, at least informs us that the San Xavier, San Borgia, and Loretto forms of speech were nearer akin to each other than to the Waikur.

English.	St. Xavier.	S. Borgia.	Loretto.	Waikur.
sky	ambayujub	ambeink	——	tererека-datemba.
earth	amet	amate-guang	——	datemba.
fire		usi	ussi	——
man	tämma	tama	tamma	ti.
father	käkka	iham	keneda	
son		uisaham	——	tshanu.

The short compositions of Hervas (given in the Mithridates) show the same.

THE WAIKUR. — This is the language of what I have called the Mannheim account, namely the anonymous work of a Jesuit missionary of the Waikur country published at Mannheim.

It gives us the following specimens — Waikur and German:

Kepè-dáre tekerekádatembi dai;
unser Vater gebogene Erd du bist;

ei-rì akatuikè-pu-me;
dich o das erkennen alle werden;

tshakárrake-pu-me ti tschie;
loben alle werden Leut und;

ecùn gracia-ri acúme carè tekerekadatembi tschie;
dein gratia o dass haben werden wir gebogene Erd und;

eiri jebarrakemi ti pu jaupe datemba
dir o dass gehorsamen werden Menschen alle heer Erd,

pae ei jebarrakere aëna kéa;
wie dir gehorsamen droben seynd;

kepecun bu. kepe ken jatúpe untairi;
unser Speis uns gebe dieser tag;

catè kuitscharakè tei tschie kepecun atacamara
uns verzehe du und unser Böses;

paè kuitscharrakère catè tschie cavape atukiàra keperujake;
wie verzehen wir auch die Böses uns thun;

catè tikakambà têi tschie;
uns helfe du und;

cuvumerà catè uè atukiàra;
wollen werden Nicht wir etwas Böses;

kepe kakunja pe atacara tschie. Amen.
uns beschutze von Bösen und. Amen.

The compound *tekereka-datembi = bent land = sky = heaven.*

To this very periphrastic Paternoster we may add the following fragments of the Waikur conjugation: —

Bè	amukirere =	*ego ludo,*
Ei		*tu ludis.*
Tutâu		*ille ludit.*
Catè		*nos ludimus.*
Petè		*vos luditis.*
Tucáva		*illi ludunt.*

Bè	amukiririkeri =	*ego lusi.*
Ei		*tu lusisti.*
Tutâu		*ille lusit.*
Catè		*nos lusimus.*
Petè		*vos lusistis.*
Tucáva		*illi luserunt.*

Amukirimè = *ludere.*

Amukiri tei = *lude.*
Amukiri tu = *ludite.*

Bè-ri	amukiririkarikara =	*I wish I had not played.*
Ei-ri		*Thou &c.*
Tutâu-ri		*He &c.*
Catè-ri		*We &c.*
Petè-ri		*Ye &c.*
Tucáva-ri		*They &c.*

Of the *Pericu* spoken at the south extremity of the peninsula, I know no specimens.

We now turn to that part of the Yuma area which lies along the course of the Gila, and more especially the parts along the Cocomaricopa villages, of which one portion of the occupants speak a language belonging to the Yuma, the other one belonging to the Pima class.

This latter leads us to the languages of the northern provinces of Mexico —

Sonora and Sinaloa.

For these two provinces, the languages for which we have specimens fall into five divisions: —

1. The Pima.
2. The Hiaqui.
3. The Tubar.
4. The Tarahumara.
5. The Cora.

That the Pima group contains the Pima Proper, the Opata, and the Eudeve, may be seen from the Mithridates. That the language of the Papagos, or Papago-cotam, is also Pima, rests upon good external evidence. Whether the speech of the Ciris, and population of the island of Tiburon and the parts opposite, be also Pima, is at present uncertain; though not likely to be so long, inasmuch as I believe that Mr. Bartlett, the Boundary Commissioner, is about to publish samples, not only of this, but of the other languages of Sonora.

West of the Pima lies the Tarahumara, and south of it the Hiaqui, succeeded by the Tubar and Cora of Sinaloa.

The following Paternosters of these four languages may be compared with the Opata dialect of the Pima. The words that, by appearing in more than one of them, command our attention and suggest the likelihood of a closer relationship than is indicated in the Mithridates, or* elsewhere, are in italics.

OPATA.

Tamo mas *tegui*acachigua *cacame;*
Amo tegua santo à;
Amo reino *tame* macte;
Hinadeia iguati *terepa ania* teguiacachivèri;
Chiama *tamo* guaco veu *tamo mac;*
Guatame neavere *tamo* cai naideni acà api tame neavere *tomo*opagua;
Gua cai *tame* taotitudare;
Cai naideñi chiguadu — Apita cachià.

HIAQUI.

Itom-achai *teve*-capo *catecame;*
Che-chevasu yoyorvva;
Itou piepsana *em* yaorahua;
Em harepo in buyapo *annua* amante *(tevecapo?)* vecapo *annua* beni;
Machuvei*tom*-buareu yem *itom* amica-*itom;*
Esoc alulutiria ca-aljiton-anecau itepo soc alulutiria ebeni *itom* veherim;
Cai*tom* butia huenacuchi cativiri betana;
Aman *itom*-yeretua.

TUBAR.

Ite-cañar *teg*muicarichua *catemat;*
*Imit teg*muarac milituraba teochiqualac;
Imit huegmica carinite bacachin-assifaguin;
Imit avamunarir echu nañagualac imo cuigan amo nachic *teg*muecaricheri;
Ite cokuatarit, essemer taniguarit, iabbe *mi*cam;
Ite tatacoli ikiri atzomua ikirirain *ite* bacachin cale kuegma naĩegua cantem;
Caisa *ite* nosam bacatatacoli;
Bacachin ackiro muetzerac *ite.*

TARAHUMARA.

Tami nonò, mamù reguì guamí gatiki;
Tami noinéruje mu regua;
Telimea rekijena;

* This conveys an inadequate notion. Buschmann has thrown the Cora and Tarahumara (connected by Adelung) into the same class with the Tepeguana and Yaqui, represented by the Cahia. — *See Note* (1859).

Tami neguaruje mu jelaliki henná, guetshiki, mapu hatschibe reguega guami;
Tami nututuge hipeba;
Tami guecanje *tami* guikeliki, matamé hatschibe reguega tami guecanje putse tami guikejameke;
Ke ta *tami* satuje;
Telegatigemeke mechka hulà. *Amen.*

Cora.

Ta yaoppe *tapa*hoa pethebe;
Cherihuaca eiia teaguarira;
Chemeahuabeni *tahemi* (to us) eiia chianaca;
Cheaquasteni eiia jevira iye (as) chianacatapoan tup up *tapa*hoa;
Eii ta hamuit *(bread)* eu te huima tahetze rej rujeve ihic *(to-day)* ta taa;
Huatauniraca ta xanacan tetup itcahmo tatahuatauni titaxanacante;
Ta vaehre teatcai havobereni xanacat hetze huabachreaca tecai tahemi rutahuaga teh eu ene.
Che-enhuatahua.

With these end our *data**, but not our lists of dialects; the names Maya, Guazave, Heria, Sicuraba, Xixime, Topia, Tepeguana, and Acaxee all being, either in Hervas, or elsewhere, as applied to the different forms of speech of Sonora and Sinaloa; to which may be added the Tahu, the Tacasca, and the Acasca, which is probably the same word as Acaxee, as Huimi is the same as Yuma, and Zaque as Hiaqui. Of the Guazave a particular dialect is named as the Ahome. Add also the Zoe and Huitcole, probably the same as the Huite.

That some of these unrepresented forms of speech belong to the same class with the Pima, Hiaqui, &c., is nearly certain. How many, however, do so is another question; it may be that *all* are in the same predicament; it may be only a few.

The languages of

Mechoacan.

These are —
1. The Pirinda.
2. The Tarasca.
3. The Otomi.

The last will be considered at once, and dismissed. More has been written on the Otomi than any other language of these parts; the proper Mexican not excepted. It was ob-

* For a notice of *Matlacinga* see Ludwig: who mentions an *Arte* and Dictionary. I have seen no specimens of it. (1859).

served by Naxera that it was *monosyllabic* rather than *polysynthetic*, as so many of the American languages are, with somewhat doubtful propriety, denominated. A Mexican language, with a Chinese characteristic, could scarcely fail to suggest comparisons. Hence, the first operation on the Otomi was to disconnect it from the languages of the New, and to connect it with those of the Old World. With his accustomed caution, Gallatin satisfies himself with stating what others have said, his own opinion evidently being that the relation to the Chinese was one of analogy rather than affinity.

Doubtless this is the sounder view; and one confirmed by three series of comparisons made by the present writer. The first shows that the Otomi, as compared with the monosyllabic languages of Asia, *en masse*, has several words in common. But the second qualifies our inferences, by showing that the Maya, a language more distant from China than the Otomi, and, by means inordinately monosyllabic in its structure, has, there or thereabouts, as many. The third forbids any separation of the Otomi from the other languages of America, by showing that it has the ordinary amount of miscellaneous affinities.

In respect to the Chinese, &c., the real question is not whether it has *so many affinities with the Otomi*, but whether it has *more affinities with the Otomi than with the Maya or any other American language;* a matter which we must not investigate without remembering that *some* difference in favour of the Otomi is to be expected, inasmuch as two languages with short or monosyllabic words will, from the very fact of the shortness and simplicity of their constituent elements, have more words alike than two polysyllabic forms of speech.

The fact, however, which most affects the place of the Otomi language is the monosyllabic character of other American languages, *e. g.* the Athabaskan and the Attacapa.

As these are likely to be the subject of some future investigation, I lay the Otomi, for the present, out of consideration; limiting myself to the expression of an opinion, to the effect that its philological affinities are not very different from what its geographical position suggests.

Of the* Pirinda and Tarasca we have grammars, or rather grammatical sketches; abstracts of which, by Gallatin, may be found in his Notes on the Semi-civilized Nations of Mexico, Yucatan, and Central America, in the first volume

* Only of the Tarasca (1859).

of the Transactions of the American Ethnological Society. The following are from the Mithridates.

PIRINDA PATERNOSTER.

Cabutumtaki ke exjechori pininte;
Niboteachatii tucathi nitubuteallu;
Tantoki hacacovi nitubutea pininte;
Tarejoki nirihonta manicatii ninujami propininte;
Boturimegui dammuce tupacovi chii;
Exgemundicovi boturichochii, kicatii pracavovi kueentumundijo boturichochijo;
Niantexechichovi rumkueentuvi innivochochii;
Moripachitovi cuinenzimo tegui.
Tuçatii.

TARASCA PATERNOSTER.

Tata uchàveri tukire hacahini avàndaro;
Santo arikeve tucheveti hacangurikua;
Wetzin andarenoni tucheveti irecheekua;
Ukuareve tucheveti wekua iskire avandaro, na humengaca istu umengave ixu excherendo.
Huchaeveri curinda hanganari pakua intzcutzini yaru;
Santzin wepovacheras huchaeveri hatzingakuareta, izki huchanac wepocacuvanita haca huchàveri hatzingakuaechani;
Ca hastzin teruhtazema teruniguta perakua himbo. Isevengua.

It now becomes convenient to turn to the parts to the east of California, viz.

UTAH AND NEW MEXICO.

In Utah the philology is simple, all its forms of speech being
1. Athabaskan;
2. Paduca; or
3. Pueblo.

1. The Navaho, along with the Jecorilla of New Mexico, the Hoopah of California, and Apatch of California, New Mexico and Sonora, is Athaqaskan.

ENGLISH.	NAVAHO.	APATCH.
man	tennai	ailee.
woman	estsonnee.....	eetzan.
head (my).....	*hu*tzeetsin	*see*zee.
hair (my)	*hu*tzee	*see*sga.
face (my)	*hu*nnee	streenee.
ear (my)	*hu*tjah	*see*tza.
eye (my)	*hu*nnah	sleeda.
nose (my).....	*hu*tchih	*see*tzee

English.	Navaho.	Apatch.
mouth (my)	*huz*zai	*shee*da.
tongue (my)	*hut*so	*shee*dare.
tooth (my)	*hur*go	*shee*go.
sky	eeyah	eah.
sun	chokonoi	skeemai.
moon	klaihonoi	clanai.
star	sonh	suns.
day	cheen-*go*	eeska.
night	klai-*go*	cla.
light	hoascen-*go*	skee.
rain	naheltinh	nagostee.
snow	yas	zahs.
hail	neelo	heeloah.
fire	konh	kou.
water	tonh	toah.
stone	tsai	zeyzay.
one	tlahee	tahse.
two	nahkee	nahkee.
three	tanh	tau.

The Utah with its allied dialects is Paduca, *i. e.* a member of the class to which the Shoshoni, Wihinast, and Cumanch languages belong.

3. The Moqui is one of the languages of

The Pueblo Indians of New Mexico.

The comparative civilization of the Pueblo Indians has always attracted the attention of the ethnologist. Until lately, however, he had but a *minimum* amount of trustworthy information concerning either their habits or their language. He has now a fair amount of *data* for both. For philological purposes he has vocabularies for six (probably for all) of them.

Of the Pueblo languages two belong to the drainage of the Rio Colorado and four to that of the Rio Grande. Of these two divisions the former lies the farthest west, and, of the two Colorado Pueblos, the most western is that of

The Moqui. — The Moqui vocabulary was procured by Lieut. Simpson from a Moqui Indian who happened to be at Chelly.

The Zuni country lies in 35° north latitude, to the south and east of the Moqui, and is probably divided by the Sierra de Zuni from

The Acoma, or Laguna, the most southern of the Pueblos of the Rio Grande. North of the Acoma area lies that of

The Jemez, on the San Josef.

The two that still stand over lie on the main stream of the Rio Grande itself. They are —

The Tesuque; and

The Taos or Picuri. — The northern boundaries of the Tesuque seem to be the southern ones of Taos. Connect these *Pueblos* with the town of Taos, and the Tesuque with Santa Fé, and the ordinary maps give us the geography.

The philological affinities of the Pueblo languages scarcely coincide with the geographical relations. The Moqui lies far west. Laying this then out of the question, the three that, in their outward signs, most strike the eye in tables, as agreeing with each other, are the Laguna, the Jemez, and the Tesuque. The other two that thus outwardly agree are the Taos and the Zuni, — two that are not in the most immediate geographical juxtaposition.

What is meant by the "outward signs that most strike the eye on tables"? This is shown in the following tables: —

English.	Zuni.	Tesuque.
head	oshoqui*nnee*	pto.
hair	tiya*hwee*	po.
ear.....	lahjo*tinnee*.....	oyez.
eye.....	tona*hwee*	tzie.
nose	nohah*hunee*	heu.
mouth.....	ahwah*tinnee*	so.
tongue	honi*nnee*	hae.
tooth	oahna*hwee*.....	muai.

The following are some of the most patent miscellaneous affinities: —

English, sun.
Tesuque, *pah.*
Jemez, *pah.*

English, moon.
Tesuque, *poyye.*
Jemez, *pahah.*
Taos, *pannah.*
Moqui, *muyah.*

English, man.
Tesuque, *sayen.*
Jemez, *tahhanenah.*

English, woman.
Tesuque, *ker.*
Zuni, *ocare.*

English, wife.
Tesuque, *naveso.*
Jemez, *neohoy.*

English, boy.
Tesuque, *onne.*
Jemez, *annoh.*

English, forehead.
Tesuque, *siccorah.*
Laguna, *cophay.*

English, face.
Tesuque, *chaay.*
Lapuna, *kowah.*

English, eye.
Tesuque, *chay.*
Jemez, *saech.*

English, teeth.
Tesuque, *muah.*
Taos, *moen-nahenhay.*
Moqui, *moah* = mouth.

English, chin.
Tesuque, *shabbok.*
Taos, *claybonhai.*

English, hand.
Tesuque, *mah.*
Jemez, *mahtish.*
Moqui, *moktay.*
Moqui, *mahlatz* = finger.

English, breast.
Tesuque, *peah.*
Laguna, *quaist-pay.*
Taos, *pahahkaynaynemay.*
Jemez, *pay-lu.*
Utah, *pay.*

English, deer.
Tesuque, *pahye.*
Jemez, *pahah.*

English, rattlesnake.
Tesuque, *payyoh.*
Taos, *pihoown.*

English, cat.
Tesuque, *musah.*
Laguna, *mus.*
Taos, *muscenah.*
Jemez, *moonsah.*
Zuni, *musah.*

English, fire.
Tesuque, *tah.*
Jemez, *twaah.*

The Moqui, which is not to be separated from the other Pueblo languages, has, out of twenty-one words compared, eight coinciding with the Utah.

Neither are there wanting words common to the Pueblo languages and those of the Athabaskan Navahos, Jecorillas and Apatches.

English, deer.
Navaho, *payer.*
Jecorilla, *payah.*
Jemez, *pahah.*

English, cat.
Navaho, *muse.*
Jecorilla, *mussah.*
Tesuque, *musah.*
Laguna, &c.*, *mus.*

English, earth.
Navaho, *ne.*
Jecorilla, *nay.*
Tesuque, *nah.*

English, man.
Navaho, *tennay.*
Jecorilla, *tinlay.*
Tesuque, *sayen.*
Jemez, *tahhanenah.*

English, mouth.
Navaho, *hu-zzay.*
Jecorilla, *hu-zzy.*
Tesuque, *sho.*

Of these the first two may be borrowed. In

KANZAS

the languages are *Arapaho*, and *Shyenne*, already noticed; and *Cumanch*, which is Paduca.

* The Utah is *musah.*

For the *Kioway* we want specimens. In

NEBRASKA

they are *Sioux*, already noticed, and *Pawni*, allied to the *Riccaree*. Kanzas leads us to

TEXAS.

It is convenient in a notice of the languages of the State of Texas to bear in mind its early, as well as its present relations to the United States. In a country where the spread of the population from the other portions of the Union has been so rapid, and where the occupancy is so complete, we are prepared to expect but a small proportion of aborigines. And such, upon the whole, is the case. The displacement of the Indian tribes of Texas has been great. Even, however, when Mexican, Texas was not in the category of the older and more original portions of Mexico. It was not brought under the *régime* of the missionaries, as we may see by turning to that portion of the Mithridates which treats of the parts west of the Mississippi. The references here are to Dupratz, to Lewis and Clarke, to Charlevoix, to French and English writers rather than to the great authority for the other parts of Spanish America — Hervas. And the information is less precise and complete. All this is because Texas in the earlier part of its history was, in respect to its exploration and description, a part of Louisiana, (and, as such, French) rather than a part of Mexico, and (as such) Spanish.

The notices of Texas, in the Mithridates, taken along with our subsequent *data*, are to the effect that (*a*) the *Caddo*, (*b*) the *Adaize* or *Adahi*, (*c*) the *Attakapa*, and (*d*) the *Choktah* are the prevailing languages; to which may be added a few others of minor importance.

The details as to the distribution of the subordinate forms of speech over these four leading languages are as follows: —

a. The Nandakoes, Nabadaches, Alich (or Eyish), and Ini or Tachi are expressly stated to be *Caddo;* and, as it is from the name of the last of these that the word Texas is derived, we have satisfactory evidence that *some* members, at least, of the Caddo family are *truly and originally* Texian.

b. The Yatassi, Natchitoches, *Adaize* (or *Adaye*), Nacogdoches, and Keyes, belong to the Caddo confederacy, but without speaking the Caddo language.

c. The Carancouas, the *Attacapas*, the Apelusas, the Mayes speak dialects of the same language.

d. The Tunicas speak the same language as the Choctahs.

Concerning the philology of the Washas, the Bedies, the Acossesaws, and the Cances, no statements are made.

It is obvious that the information supplied by the Mithridates is measured by the extent of our knowledge of the four languages to which it refers.

Of these, the Choktah, which Adelung calls the Mobilian, is the only one for which the Mithridates itself supplies, or could supply, specimens; the other three being unrepresented by any sample whatever. Hence, to say that the Tachi was Caddo, that the Yatassi was Adahi, or that the Carancoua was Attacapa, was to give an instance, in the way of explanation, of the *obscurum per obscurius*. Since the publication of the Mithridates, however, we have got samples of all three — Caddo, Adahi, and Attacapa — so that our standards of comparison are improved. They are to be found in a tabulated form, and in a form convenient for collation and comparison in both of Gallatin's papers. They were all collected before the annexation of Texas, and they appear in the papers just referred to as Louisiana, rather than truly Texian, languages; being common to the two areas.

Of the works and papers written upon Texas since it became a field of observation for English and American, as opposed to French and Spanish observers, the two on which the present writer, when he treated of the subject in his work on the Varieties of Mankind, most especially, and perhaps exclusively relied, were the well-known work of Kennedy on Texas, and a MS. with which he was favoured by Mr. Bollaert, specially limited to the ethnology of the State. Of this MS. a short abstract is to be found in the Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science for the year 1846, made by Mr. Bollaert himself.

The later the notice of Texas the greater the prominence given to a tribe of which nothing is said in the Mithridates; viz. the *Cumanch*. As late as 1844 we had nothing beyond the numerals and a most scanty MS. list of words to tell us what the Cumanch language really was. These, however, were sufficient to show that its affinities were of a somewhat remarkable kind, viz. with the Shoshoni, or Snake, tongues of the southern parts of Oregon*. In Mr. Bollaert's notice

* "On the Languages of the Oregon Territory." By R. G. Latham. M. D. Read before the Ethnological Society, Dec. 1844. — *Note.*

the Cumanches are divided into three sections: (1) the Cumanch or Jetan, (2) the Lemparack, and (3) the Tenuha, and a list of no less than thirty-five other tribes follows this division, some of these being said to be wholly extinct, some partially so; some to be more or less Cumanch, some to be other than Cumanch.

The tendency of the Mithridates is to give prominence to the Caddo, Attacapa, and Adahi tongues, and to incline the investigator, when dealing with the other forms of speech, to ask how far they are connected with one of these three. The tendency of the writers last-named is to give prominence to the Cumanch, and to suggest the question: How far is this (or that) form of speech Cumanch or other than Cumanch?

Working with the Mithridates, the MS. of Mr. Bollaert, and Mr. Kennedy's volume on Texas before me, I find that the list of Texian Indians which these authorities justified me in publishing in 1848, contained (1) Coshattas, (2) Towiachs, Towakenos, Towecas, and Wacos, (3) Lipans or Sipans, (4) Aliche or Eyish, (5) Acossesaws, (6) Navaosos, (7) Mayes, (8) Cances, (9) Toncahuas, (10) Tuhuktukis, (11) Unataquas or Anadarcos, (12) Mascovie, (13) Tawanis or Ionis, (14) Wico, ? Waco, (15) Avoyelles, (16) Washitas, (17) Ketchi, (18) Xaramenes, (19) Caicaches, (20) Bidias, (21) Caddo, (22) Attacapa, (23) Adahi; besides the Carankahuas (of which the Cokes are made a branch) classed with the Attacapa, and not including certain Cherokees, Choctahs, Chikkasahs, and Sioux.

A *Washita* vocabulary, which will be referred to in the sequel, concludes the list of Texian languages known by specimens.

At present, then, the chief question respecting the philology of Texas is one of distribution. Given as centres to certain groups

1. The Choctah,
2. The Caddo,
3. The Adahi,
4. The Attakapa,
5. The Cumanch, and
6. The Washita languages,

how do we arrange the tribes just enumerated? Two works help us here: — 1. A letter from the Ex-president Burnett to Schoolcraft on the Indians of Texas. Date 1847. 2. A Statistical Notice of the same by Jesse Stem. Date 1851.

Stem's statistics run thus: —

Tribes.	Numbers.	
Towacarros	141	
Wacos	114	293
Ketchies	38	
Caddos	161	
Andarcos	202	476
Ioni	113	
Tonkaways	1152	
Wichitas.....	100	
Lipans	500	
Comanches.....	20,000	

giving us several of the names that have already appeared; giving also great prominence to the Cumanches — numerally at least.

In Mr. Burnett's Letter the term *Caddo* is prominent; but whether it denote the Caddo *language*, or merely the Caddo *confederation*, is uncertain. Neither can I find from the context whether the statements respecting the Indians of the Caddo connexion (for this is what we must call it at present) are made on the personal authority of the writer, or whether they are taken, either directly or indirectly, from the Mithridates. The term that Burnett uses is *stock*, his statement being that the Waco, the Tawacani, the Towiash, the Aynic, the San Pedro Indians, the Nabaducho, and the Nacodocheets are all both Texian in origin and Caddo in *stock*.

His other tribes are —

1. The *Ketchi:* a small tribe on Trinity River, hated by the Cumanches as sorcerers, and, perhaps, the same as —

2. The *Hitchi*, once a distinct tribe, now assimilated with their neighbours.

3. The *Tonkaways*, a separate tribe, of which, however, the distinctive characters are not stated.

Whatever may be the exact details of the languages, dialects, and subdialects of Texas, the general outline is simple.

The *Choctah* forms of speech are anything but native. They are of foreign origin and recent introduction. So are certain Sioux and other dialects spoken within the Texian area.

The *Cumanch* is in the same predicament; though not, perhaps, so decidedly. It belongs to the Paduca class, and its affinities are with the Shoshoni and Wihinast of Oregon.

The *Caddo* Proper is said to be intrusive, having been introduced so late as 1819 from the parts between the great Raft and the Natchitoches or Red River. I hold, however, that *some* Caddo forms of speech must be indigenous.

The *Witchita* is probably one of these: —

English.	Caddo.	Witchita.
head	cundo	etskase.
hair	beunno	deodske.
eye	nockkochun	kidahkuck.
nose	sol	dutstistoe.
mouth	nowoese	hawkoo.
tongue	ockkotunna	hutskee.
tooth	ockkodeta	awk.
one	whiste	cherche.
two	bit	mitch.
three	dowoh	daub.
four	peaweh	dawquats.
five	dissickka	esquats.
six	dunkkee	kehass.
seven	bissickka	keopits.
eight	dowsickka	keotope.
nine	pewesickka	sherchekeeite.
ten	binnah	skedorash.

Te *Adahi* has already been noticed as being a comparatively isolated language, but, nevertheless, a language with numerous miscellaneous affinities.

The *Attacapa* is one of the pauro-syllabic languages of America, by which I mean languages that, if not monosyllabic after the fashion of the languages of south-eastern Asia, have the appearance of being so. They form a remarkable class, but it is doubtful whether they form a natural one, *i. e.* whether they are more closely connected with each other in the other elements of philological affinity than they are with the tongues not so characterized. They deserve, however, what cannot be given in the present paper, a special consideration.

For the north-eastern districts of Mexico, New Leon, Tamaulipas, &c., *i. e.* for the ports between the Rio Grande and Tampico, no language is known to us by specimens. It is only known that the Cumanch dips deeply into Mexico. So does the Apatsh.

A tribe, lately mentioned, that of the Lipans, is, *perhaps*, Apatsh. Burnett states that they agree with the Mescalero and Seratics of the parts about the Paso del Norte. For these, however, we still want vocabularies *iis nominibus*.

Be the Lipan affinities what they may, it is clear that both the Cumanch and Apatsh languages belong to a class foreign to a great part of the areas over which they are spread — foreign, and (as such) intrusive — intrusive, and (as such) developed at the expense of some native language.

That the original area of the latter is that of the Navahos, Jecorillas, Hoopahs, Umkwas, Tlatskanai, and that these occupy the parts between the Algonkin and Eskimo frontiers — parts as far north as the Arctic circle — has already been stated. No repetition, however, is superfluous that gives definitude and familiarity to the very remarkable phænomena connected with the geographical distribution of the Athabaskans.

Neither are the details of the Paduca area — the area of the Wihinast, Shoshoni, Utah, and Cumanch forms of speech — without interest. To the north of California, the Wihinast, or Western Shoshonis, are separated from the Pacific by a thin strip of Jacon and Kalapuya country, being succeeded in the direction of Utah by the Shoshonis Proper. Then follow the Bonaks and Sampiches; the Shoshoni affinities of which need not be doubted, though the evidence of them is still capable of improvement. The Utah of the parts about Lake Utah is known to us by a vocabulary; and known to be Cumanch or Shoshoni — call it which you will. I call them all *Paduca*, from a population so named by Pike.

Now, out of twenty-one words common to the Utah and Moqui, eight are alike.

Again, the Shoshoni and Sahaptin have several words in common, and those out of short vocabularies.

Thirdly, the Shoshoni and Wihinast, though spoken within (comparatively) narrow limits, differ from each other more than the several forms of the Cumanch, though spread over a vast tract of land.

The inference from this is, that the Paduca forms of South Oregon and Utah are *in situ;* those of New Mexico, Texas, and New Leon, &c. being intrusive. In respect to these, I imagine that a line drawn from the south-eastern corner of the Utah Lake to the source of the Red or Salt Fork branch of the River Arkansas, would pass through a country nearly, if not wholly, Paduca; a country which would lie partly in Utah, partly in New Mexico, and partly in Kansas. It would cross the Rocky Mountains, or the watershed between the drainages of the Colorado and the Missouri. It would lie along a high and barren country. It would have on its west the Navaho, Moqui, and Apatsh areas; on its east certain Sioux tribes, and (further south) the Arapahos and Shyennes. It would begin in California and end in the parts about Tampico*.

* For a full notice of Texas see Buschmann's Supplementary Volume; first published within the present year (1859).

Mexico. — Guatimala.

The Cumanches, on the very verge, or within the tropics, vex by their predatory inroads the Mexican states of Zacatecas and Durango. Along with the Lipans they are the sparse occupants of the Bolson de Mapimi. Along with the Apaches they plunder the traders and travellers of Chihuhua.

For the parts about Tampico the language belongs to the Huasteca branch of

The Maya. — The Maya succeeds the language just enumerated on the *east*. On the *west*, the Otomi, Pirinda, and Tarasca are succeeded by

The Mexican Proper. — But the Maya and Mexican Proper are languages of such importance, that the present paper will merely notify their presence in Mexico and Central America.

The languages that, from their comparative obscurity, claim the attention of the investigator, are those which are *other than* Maya and *other than* Mexican Proper.

Of these, the first succeeds the Huasteca of Huastecapan, or the parts about Tampico; which it separates, or helps to separate, from the northern branches of the Maya Proper, being

The Totonaca of Vera Cruz, of which the following is the Paternoster; the German being that of the Mithridates.

Totonaca.

Unser Vater o im Himmel steht
Quintlatcané nac tiayan huil;
gemacht hoch werde dein Nahme
Tacollalihuacahuanli ò mi maocxot;
komme dein (reich?)
Niquiminanin ò mintacacchi
gethan werde dein Wille
Tacholahuanla ò min pahuat
wie wie im Himmel
Cholei ix cacnitiet chalchix nac tiayan;
unser Brot,
O quin chouhcan lacalliya
uns gib heute
niquilaixquiuh yanohue;
uns vergib unsre Sünde
Caquilamatzancaniuh quintacalhtcan

wie wir vergeben
Chonlei ò quitnan lamatzancaniyauh
unsern Schuldigern
ò quintalac allaniyan;
Und nicht uns lasse
Ca ala quilamactaxtoyauh
damit wir stehen in Versuchung
Nali yojauh naca liyogni
gethan werde
Chontacholacahuanla.

The same from Hervas.

Kintaccan ò natiayan huill;
Tacotllali huacahuanla o min paxca maocxot
Camill omintagchi,
Tacholaca huanla ixcagnitiet ot
skiniau chon cholacan ocnatiayan;
Alyanohue nikila ixkiu ki lacali chaocan;
Kilamatzancaniau kintacagllitcan
Kintalacatlanian ochonkinan iclamatzan —
Caniau kintalacatlanian;
Nikilamapotaxtou ala nicliyolau
lacotlanacatalit nikilamapotexto
lamatzon lacacoltana.
Chontacholacahuanla.

Cross the watershed from Vera Paz to Oaxaca, and you come to the area of

The Mixteca. — In the ordinary maps, Tepezcolula, on the boundaries of Oaxaca and Puebla, is the locality for its chief dialect, of which there are several.

Mixteca Paternoster.

Dzutundoo, zo dzicani andihui;
Naca cuncihuando sasanine;
Nakisi santoniisini;
Nacahui ñuuñaihui saha yocuhui inini dzahuatnaha yocuhni andihui;
Dzitandoo yutnaa tasinisindo hiutni;
Dzandooni cuachisindo dzaguatnaha yodzandoondoondi hindo suhani sindoo;
Huasi kihui ñahani nucuctandodzondo kuachi;
Tahui ñahani ndihindo sahañavvhuaka dzahua;
Nacuhui.

The Mixteca succeeds the Mexican Proper, itself being other than Mexican, just as the Totonaca succeeded the Huasteca, which was Maya, the Totonaca being other than Maya.

The Mixteca is the language of Northern,

The ZAPOTECA that of Southern, Oaxaca.

Hervas writes, that the Zapoteca, Mazateca, Chinanteca, and Mixe were allied. The Mixe locality is the district around Tehuantepec.

South of the areas of the three languages just enumerated comes the main division of the Maya — the Maya of Guatemala and Yucatan, as opposed to the Huasteca of the parts about Tampico. This, however, we pass over *sicco pede*, for

HONDURAS AND SAN SALVADOR.

Limiting ourselves to the districts that undeniably belong to those two States, we have samples of four dialects of

The LENCA language; these being from the four Pueblos of Guajiquiro, Opatoro, Intibucá, and Sirmlaton, those of the last being shorter and less complete than the others. They are quite recent, and are to be found only in the Spanish edition of Mr. Squier's Notes on Central America. The English is without them.

ENGLISH.	GUAJIQUIRO.	OPATORO.	INTIBUCA.
man	——	taho	amashe.
woman	——	move	napu.
boy	——	guagua	hua.
head	toco	tohoro	cagasi.
ear	yang	yan	yangaga.
eye	saing	saringla	saring.
nose	napse	napseh	nepton.
mouth	ingh	ambeingh	ingori.
tongue	nafel	navel	napel.
teeth	nagha	neas	nigh.
neck	ampsh	ampshala	cange.
arm	kenin	kenin	kening.
fingers	lasel	gualalasel	——
foot	güagi	quagi	guaskaring.
blood	uahug	uah	quch.
sun	gasi	gashi	gashi.
star	siri	siri	——
fire	uga	'ua	yuga.
water	guass	uash	guash.
stone	ca	cah	tupan.
tree	ili	ili	ili.

English.	Guajiquiro.	Opatoro.	Intibuca.
one	ita	ita	itaska.
two	naa	——	——
three	lagua	——	——
four	aria	——	——
five	saihe	saihe	——
six	huie	hue	——
seven	huis-ca	——	——
eight	teef-ca	——	——
nine	kaiapa	——	——
ten	isis	issis	——

As Mr. Squier is the sole authority for the Lenca of San Salvador and Honduras, so he is for

Nicaragua.

Limiting ourselves to the undoubtedly Nicaraguan area, and taking no note of the Mexican Proper of more than one interesting Mexican settlement, the three forms of speech for which we have specimens are —

1. The Choretega;
2. The Nagranda; and
3. The Wulwa, of the Chontal district.

And now we pass to the Debateable Ground. The language of

The Moskito Country

gives us a fourth form of speech; at least (I think) as different from the Choretega, Nagranda, Wulwa and Lenca, as they are from each other. This is —

The Waikna of the Indians of the coast, and, probably, of several allied tribes inland.

Of the Waikna, Wulwa, Nagranda, and Choretega, samples may be found either in Squier's Nicaragua, or vol. iii. of the Transactions of the American Ethnological Society.

English.	Nagranda.	Choretega.
man	rahpa	*n*uho.
woman	rapa-ku	*n*-ahseyomo.
boy	sai-ka	*n*-asome.
girl	sai-kee	*n*-aheyum.
child	chichi	*n*-aneyame.
father	ana	goo-ha.
mother	autu	goo-mo.
husband	a'mbin	'mhohue.

English.	Nagranda.	Choretega.
wife	a'guyu	*n*ume.
son	sacul-e	*n*-asomeyamo.
daughter	saicul-a	*n*-asayme.
head	a'cu	goochemo.
	edi	—
hair	tu'su	membe.
face	enu	grote.
forehead	guitu	goola.
ear	nau	nuhme.
eye	setu	nahte.
nose	ta'co	mungoo.
mouth	dahnu	numsu.
tongue	duhu	greuhe.
tooth	semu	nahe.
foot	naku	graho.
sky	dehmalu	nekupe.
sun	ahca	numbu.
star	ucu	nuete.
fire	ahku	nahu.
water	ecia	nimbu.
stone	esee	nugo.
	esenu	—
I	ic-u	saho.
thou	ic-a	sumusheta.
he	ic-a	—
we	hechel-u	semehmu.
ye	hechel-a	—
they	icanu	—
this	ca-la	—

For the Waikna there are other materials. The Wulwa specimens are few. Hence it may be doubtful whether the real difference between it and the Waikna be so great as the following table suggests.

English.	Wulwa.	Waikna.
man	all	waikna.
woman	y-all	mairen.
son	pau-ni-ma	lupia-waikna.
daughter	pau-co-ma	lupia-mairen.
head	tunni	let.
eye	minik-taka	nakro.
nose	magni-tak	kamka.
mouth	dinibas	bila.
blood	anassca	tala.
all	duwawa	semehmu.

English.	Wulwa.	Waikna.
drink	mahuia	bo-prima.
run	dagalnu	bo-tupu.
leap	masiga	bo-ora.
go	aiyu	pa-ya.
	icu	—
sing	nagamo	pa-coondamu.
sleep	ami	pa-yacope.

Costa Rica.

The following is from a vocabulary of Dr. Karl Scherzers of the languages of the *Blanco*, *Valiente*, and *Talamenca* Indians of Costa Rica, occupants of the parts between the River Zent and the Boca del Toro. We may call it a specimen of

The Talamenca. — It seems to be, there or thereabouts, as different from the preceding languages as they are from each other.

English.	Talamenca.	English.	Talamenca.
ear	*su*-kuke.	*star*	bewue.
eye	*su*-wuaketei.	*fire*	tshuko.
nose	*su*-tshukoto.	*water*	ditzita.
mouth	*su*-'kuwu.	*one*	e-*tawa*.
tongue	*es*-kuptu.	*two*	bo-*tewa*.
tooth	*sa*-ka.	*three*	magna-*tewa*.
beard	*sa*-karku mezili.	*four*	ske-*tewa*.
neck-joint?	tzin.	*five*	*si-tawa*.
arm	*sa*-fra.	*six*	*si-wo-ske*-le.
hand	*sa-fra-tzin*-sek.	*seven*	*si-wo*-wora.
finger	*fra*-wuata.	*eight*	*si-wo*-magnana.
nail	sa-krasku.	*nine*	*si-wo-ske-tewa*.
sun	kanhue.	*ten*	*sa*-flat-ka.
moon	tulu.		

The same volume of the Transactions of the American Ethnological Society that supplies us with Mr. Squier's vocabularies for Nicaragua supplies us with Dr. Seeman's for

Veragua.

These being for

The Bayano;

The Savaneric; and

The Cholo.

The Cholo is the same as Dr. Cullen's Yule, and also the same as Cunacuna and Darien of Balbi and the Mithridates.

English.	Cunacuna.	Darien.
one	quensa-cua	conjungo.
two	vo-cua	poquah.
three	paa-cua	pauquah.
four	paque-cua	pake-quah.
five	atale	eterrah.
six	ner-cua	indricah.
seven	cugle	coogolah.
eight	vau-agua	paukopah.
nine	paque-hague	pakekopah.
ten	ambegui	anivego.

It is also the same as some short specimens of the Mithridates; where

water = dulah.
moon = nu.
father = tautah.
mother = naunah.
brother = rupah.
sister = ninah.
wife (woman) = poonah.

The Cholo leads us into South America, where for the present, we leave it.

ADDENDA.

I will now add two notes, which may possibly save some future investigator an unremunerative search.

First, concerning a language called *Mocorosi.* — In Jülg, this is made a language of Mexico. It is really the *Moxa* of South America under an altered name.

English.	Mokorosi.	Moxa.
I	nùti	nuti.
thou	pìti	piti.
he	ema	ema.
this	màca	maca.
that	màena	maena.
that you	màro	maro.
she	esu	esu.
my	nuyee	nuyee.
thy	piyee	piyee.
his	mayee	mayee.
one	eto.	eto.
two	api.	api.
three	mopo	mopo.

This is from an *Arte y vocabulario de la Lengua Mocorosi, compuesto por un padre de la compañia de Jesus missionero de la Provincias de los Moxos dedicado a la Serenissima Reyna de los Angeles siempre Virgen Maria, Patrona de estas Missiones; en Madrid, año de* 1699.

A Lima edition A.D. 1701 differs from this in omitting the name *Mokorosi*, and being dedicated to a different patron. In other respects the two works agree *verbatim et literatim*.

Secondly, in respect to a language called *Timuacuana* — For this we have a *Catechismo y examen para los que comulgan ex lengua Castellana y Timuquana, por el Padre Fr. Francisco Pareja;* and *y Padre de la Provincia de Santa Elena de la Florida*, &c. *Mexico*, 1627.

Also, the following numerals in Balbi, perhaps, taken from the above: —

English.	Timuacuana.	English.	Timuacuana.
one	minecotamano.	*six*	napikichama.
two	nauchamima.	*seven*	napikinahuma.
three	nahapumina.	*eight*	napekechetama.
four	nacheketamima.	*nine*	natumama.
five	namaruama.		

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA
(1859).

P. 252. — "*Is not this Mozino's?*" — No. For a further notice see *p.* 388.

P. 258. — "*Kawichen and Tlaoquatch.*" — The Kawichen is nearer to the Nusdalum, Squallyamish, and Cathlascou than it is to the Tlaoquatch. This may be seem in Buschmann p. 649. At the same time it is more Tlaoquatch than Buschmann makes it.

P. 259. — "*The Athabascan languages are undoubtedly Eskimo.*" — Between the notice contained in p. 299 and the paper which precedes it there is an interval of no less than five years. There is also one of three years between it and the paper which follows.

Now up to 1850 I gave the term *Eskimo* a power which I afterwards found reason to abandon. I gave it the power of a generic name for a class containing not only the Eskimo Proper, but the Athabascan, and the Kolooch. The *genus*, though in a modified form, I still believe to exist; I have ceased, however, to think that *Eskimo* is the best name for it. Hence, expressions like "the Athabascan languages are, undoubtedly, Eskimo — and the Kolŏoch languages are equally Eskimo with the Athabascan" must be read in the sense of the author as expressed in *p.* 265 — "that the line of demarcation between the Eskimo and the Indian races of America was for too broad and trenchant."

Whether certain forms of speech were not connected with the Eskimo Proper — the Eskimo in the limited and *specific* meaning of the term — is another question. The Ugalents was so treated. The Kenay — until the publication of Sir T. Richardson's Loncheux specimens — was made both too Eskimo and too Kolooch. On the other hand, however, both the Eskimo and the Koluch were divisions of the same order. The actual value of the term *Kolooch* is even now uncertain.

P. 276. — "*The Ahnenin etc.*" — A reference to the word ARRAPAHOES in Ludwig's Bibliotheca Glottica (both in the body of the work and the Addenda) suggests a doubt as to the accuracy of the form *Ahnenin*. Should it not be *Atsina?*

Turner remarks that "there is no evidence that Dr. Latham

collated" Mackenzie's vocabulary — which, as far as the text of Ludwig goes, is true enough. I had, however, *vivâ voce*, informed Ludwig's Editor that I had done so. As Turner knew nothing of this is remark was a proper one. The main question, however, touches the form of the word. Is *Ahnenin* or *Atsina* right? I can not make out the later history of the MS. In my own part, I copied, collated, and returned it; and I imagine that it still be amongst either Prichard's or Gallatin's papers. I have the transcript before me at this moment; which runs thus. "The vocabularies of the Blackfeet, of the Crows or Upsarokas," "and of the Grosventre, Rapid, or Fall Indians who call themsel" "ves Ahnenin; by D. M. M'Kenzie of the St Louis American Furr" "Comp. They appear to belong to three distinct families. But" "the Crowsspeak a dialect clearly belonging to the same language" "as that of the sedentary Minitares and Mandans, which is Sioux."

English.	Ahnenin.	English.	Ahnenin.
ax	hanarse.	*good*	etah.
awl	bay.	*Gros Ventres Indian*	ahnenin.
American	basseway.	*girl (young)*	wahtha.
Assineboin	attinene.	*god (sun)*	esis.
blue	wahtaniyo.	*going (I am)*	nehichauch.
blanket	nehatiyo.	— *(where are you)*	takahah.
brandy	kinatlyo.	*going away*	nehahtha.
balls	kutchemutche.	*give me*	tsikit.
buttons	hahkeatta.	— *him*	binenah.
berries	bin.	*horse*	wasahhun.
blood	barts.	*hair*	betaninita.
bull buffalo	nican.	*hand*	ikickan.
cow buffalo	etanun.	*hungry*	asinun.
bear	wussa.	*iron*	bachit.
bad	wahnattha.	*key*	tanaga.
Blackfoot Indian	wahtanetas.	*knife*	wahata.
Blood Indian	cowwenine.	*kettle*	busetanah.
comb	chattiya.	*kill*	paahun.
cord	ahthauatz.	*leg*	nanaha.
cup	anah.	*leggings*	nattah
coat	beethintun.	*lodge*	neahnun.
calf	wo.	— *poles*	ahearsum.
cheat	chahhawdo.	*love*	abathatta.
Crow Indian	owwenin.	*lice*	bettabin.
coming, I am	kitowats.	*meat, fresh*	ahhan.
dog	ahttah.	—, *dry*	ahhthan.
deer	nosik.	—, *fat*	netun.
drink	nahbin.	*mouth*	ochya.
ear-rings	iyand.	*me*	nistow.
ears	etah.	*mine*	nistow.
eyes	araithya.	*man, white*	nehato.
elk	wussea.	—, *black*	ʁʍtamahat.
eat	ahbeetse.	*many*	akaka.
foot	nahatta.	*nose*	huse.
friend, my	beneche.	*now*	wahne.
gun	kutcheum.	*no*	chieu.

ENGLISH.	AHNENIN.	ENGLISH.	AHNENIN.
none, I have	ichscho.	*rock*	hannike.
gun-powder	keatah.	*ribs*	netzsun.
pan	basiana-	*robe*	tovau.
pipe	einpssah.	*run*	nunahho,
poor	ahtabinou.	*roast*	estan.
quit	nannan.	*river*	natcha.
scarletcloth	benatiyo.	*wolf*	kiadah.
spoon	abiyon.	*water*	nitsa.
salt	ekiowa.	*whisky*	nahattonuche.
sugar	nahattobin.	*wife*	etha.
sleep	nuckcoote.	*fingers*	naha.
strike	towwonah.	— *nails*	hussa.
sun	esis.	*you*	ahnan.
still be	owwahtatz.	*yes*	aha.
tobacco	kichtahwan.	*I don't want it*	natah.
teeth	etchit.	*sit down*	kannutz.
thigh	neteto.	*get up*	kayhatz.
to-day	wanaki.	*where is it*	tahto.
to-morrow	nacah.	*there it is*	nayyo.
take it	etanah.	*two*	nethiyau.
vermillion	nehatto noven.	*four*	yahnayau.
understand, do you!	ahnetan.	*six*	nekitukiyau.
—, *I do not*	hachinetou.	*ten*	netassa.
wood	bess.		

As the MS. was written with unusual clearness and distinctness I have no doubt as to *Ahnenin* having been the word. That Prichard read it so is evident; for the foregoing explanation has made it clear that he and I are independent witnessess. If error, then, exists it his in the MS.

The Blackfoot and Crow (which having also transcribed, I have by me) are as follows:—

ENGLISH.	BLACKFEET.	CROW.
sun	nawtoas	
little old foot		sakahbooatta.
spirit	eishtom	
bad spirit		appanahhe.
man (vir)	nayshetappe	bettse.
Indian	do	ahsarroka*.
woman	ahkeya	meyakatte.
boy	sacoomahpa	*skak*katte.
girl	ahkaquoin	meyakatte.
child	*pôk*ah	*bak*katte.
father	onwa	menoomphe.
mother	ochrist	ekien.
husband	ohmah	batchene.
wife	ohtoohka*mah*	*mooah*.
son	*nohc*oah	me*nark*batte.
daughter	netan	me*nark*mea.
brother	nausah	*booc*ouppa, see *child*.
sister	niskan	*booc*oupmea.
head	otoquoin	marshun.

* Or *Upsaroka*, name of nation.

ENGLISH.	BLACKFEET.	CROW.
hair	otoqnoin	mishiah.
— *of animal*	ohqueiz	
face	ostokais	sa
forehead	ohnez	hhea.
ear	ohtokeis	uppa.
eye	ohwappispe	meishta.
nose	ohkissis	buppa.
mouth	mau*ihhe*	*e'a* — teeth.
tongue	matzsinne	dayszske.
teeth	ohpaykin	*ea* — mouth.
beard	emooye	eshaesha.
neck	ohkokin	shuah.
arm	ohtsis	barre.
hand	ohkittakes	buschie.
nail	owatanokitz	muhhpe.
body	ostome	boohhooah.
belly	ohkoin	ba're.
leg	ohcat	buchoope.
feet	oaksakah	busche.
toes	oakkitteaks	itshearahabi.
bone	ohkinnah	hoore.
heart	ohhskitzpohpe	nasse.
blood	ahhahpanna	eda.
town	ahkawkimne	ashchen.
chief	nenah	bettsetsa — see next
warrior		*nassa*battsats.
war-party	*soohah*	
friend	netakka	skeah.
house	nappenweeze	assua.
kettle	eske	baruhhea.
arrow	apse	ahnaitz.
bow	espickanawmi	bistuheah.
hatchet	anahcokaksakkin	matchepa — knife.
knife	estowine	mitsa — hatchet.
canoe	ahkeosakis	maheshe.
shoes	ahtsakin	hoompe.
bread	ksahquonats	hohhazzsu.
pipe	ahcooiweman	impsa.
tobacco	pistahkaw	hopa.
sky	espoht	ahmahho.
sun	naw*toas*	ahhhizu.
moon	naut*oas*	minnatatche.
star	cakat*oas*	*ekieie.*
day	christo*cooe*	maupa.
night	*coocooe*	oche.
light	christecoonatz	thieshe.
darkness	eskenutz	chippusheka.
morning	eskanattame	chinnakshea.
evening	ahtakkote	appah.
spring	motse	meamukshe.
summer	napoos	do.
autumn	motose	bisse.
winter	stooya	mannees.
wind	supooa	hootsee.
thunder	christecoom	soo.

ENGLISH.	BLACKFEET.	CROW.
lightening	christecoom	thaheshe.
rain	soatah	hannah.
snow	ohpootah	biah.
hail	sahco	makkoopah.
fire	esteu	bidah.
water	ohhkeah	*minne.*
ice	sacoocootah	beroohke.
earth	ksahcoom	amma.
river	neekkittiz	ahesu.
lake	omahsekame	*minnee*teekah.
island	mane	*minne*peshu.
valley	kinekime	ahrachuke.
hill	natoom	mahpo.
mountain	mastake	ahmahabbe.
stone	ohcootoke	mi.
copper	* ohtaquinnakeskin	ommattishe.
iron	nakeshin	omatte.
sea	motohkin	minnectskishah.
tree	masetis	bahcoo.
bark	ohtokeskissase	*eshe.*
grass	mahtoyase	beka.
maize	eskatah	hohhartzhee.
oak	cahpokesa	dachpitseesmoney.
pine	pahtoke	*bartche.*
wood	masetis	money.
fire-wood	mamase	.....
leaf	soyapoko	moneyahpe.
meat	akesequoiu	arookka.
beaver	kakestake	beruppe.
elk	poonahkah	eitchericazzse.
deer	ahnakkas	ohha.
bullbuffalo	estumeek	.....
cowbuffalo	skain	.....
buffalo	.....	bisha.
herd of buffaloes	enaho	.....
bear	keiyo	duhpitsa.
wolf	mahcooya	chata.
dog	emittah	biska.
squirrel	omahcookahte	ishtadaze — rabbit.
rabbit, *hare*	ahtetah	ishta.
fox	ohtahtooya	cheesuptedahha.
snake	patrakesema	eanhassa.
bird	pakesa	dickkappe.
egg	ohwas	eikkieu.
goose	emahkiya	mena.
pigeon	pispistsa	main*pituse.*
partridge	katokin	chitchkekah.
turkey	.....	dickkekskocke.
duck	siakes	mehhaka.
fish	mamea	booah.
white	ksiksenum	chose.
black	sikksenum	shupitkat.

* See *yellow.*

English.	Blackfeet.	Crow.
red	mohesenum	hishckat.
blue	comona	shuakat.
yellow	ohtahko	shirekat.
great	ohmohcoo	esah.
small	enahcootse	*ecat.*
strong	miskappe	bassats.
old	nahpe	carraharra.
good	ahse	itsicka.
bad	pahcaps	kubbeek.
handsome	mahtsoapse	esissa.
ugly	pahcapse	eishkubbeek.
alive	sakatappe	itchasa.
dead	aadne	carrashe.
cold	stooyah	hootshere.
warm	kasetotzu	ahre.
I	nisto	bé.
thou	christo	de.
he	ootowe	na
we	nistonan	bero.
you	christo	dero.
they	ostowawah	mihah.
this	kanahka	*kinna.*
that	do.	ahcooka.
all	atesinekah	hooahcasse.
many	akkiom	ahhook.
who	sakayitz	sippe.
what		sappah.
to-day	ahnookchusequoix	hinnemaupa.
yesterday	mahtone	hooriz.
to-morrow	ahpenacose	shinnakshare.
yes	ah	hotah.
no	sah	barretkah.
to eat	oyeatz	bahbooshmeka.
— *drink*	semate	*smimmik.*
— *run*	ohmahkoit	akharoosh.
— *dance*	pascah	dishshe.
— *go*	eestappote	dah.
— *sing*	anihkit	munnohe.
— *sleep*	okat	mugghumme.
— *speak*	apooyatz	*bidow.*
— *see*	ahsappatz	ahmukkah.
— *love*	tahcoomatzeman	ahmutcheshe.
— *kill*	enikke	bahpake.
— *walk*	ahwahocat	nene.
1	sa	ahmutcat.
2	nahtoka	noomcat.
3	nahhoka	namenacat.
4	nasowe	shopecat.
5	nesitto	chihhocat.
6	nowwe	ahcamacat.
7	akitsekum	sappoah.
8	nahnissowe	noompape.
9	pakeso	ahmuttappe.
10	kepo	perakuk.
11	makesikepoto	ehpemut.

English.	Blackfeet.	Crow.
12	nahsikepoto	ehpenoomp.
20	nahsikpo	noompaperruka.
30	nehapepo	namenaperruka.
100	kapippooe	peereeksah.
1000	kapippippooe	peereeksahperaka.

The Italics are the present author's. They draw attention to either a coincidence between the two languages, or the compound character of the word.

II. — *The Sioux group.* — For a remark on the affinities between the Pawni and Caddo, see *p.* 400.

The following coincidences are the result of a very limited collation.

(1).

Cherokee and Caddo.

English	man.	*English*	thief.
Cherokee	*askaya.*	Cherokee	*kanawskiski.*
Caddo	*shoeh.*	Caddo	*kana.*
English	woman.	*English*	day.
Cherokee	*anigeyung.*	Cherokee	*kata.*
Seneca	*wenneau.*	Caddo	*kaadeh.*
English	skin.	*English*	great.
Cherokee	*kanega.*	Cherokee	*equa.*
Mohawk	*kernayhoo.*	Caddo	*hiki.*
English	ox.	*English*	eagle.
Cherokee	*wakakanali.*	Cherokee	*awawhali.*
Caddo	*wakusyeasa.*	Caddo	*eeweh.*
English	cow.	*English*	thick.
Cherokee	*wakaagisi.*	Cherokee	*uhaketign.*
Caddo	*wakus.*	Caddo	*hiakase.*

(2).

Cherokee and Iroquois.

English	enemy.	*English*	far.
Cherokee	*agiskaji.*	Cherokee	*inung.*
Seneka	*ungkishwauish.*	Mohawk	*eenore.*
English	mouth.	*English*	*conjurer.*
Cherokee	*sinungtaw.*	Cherokee	*atawniski.*
Seneka	*swanetaut.*	Mohawk	*ahtoonitz.*
English	something.	*English*	aunt.
Cherokee	*kawhusti.*	Cherokee	*etsi.*
Seneka	*gwustah.*	Seneka	*ahhi.*
English	nothing.	*English*	my right hand.
Cherokee	*tlakawhusti.*	Cherokee	*tsikatesixquoyeni.*
Seneka	*tataqwhista.*	Mohawk	*gowweeintlataquoh.*

English	a corn.	*English*	horn.
Cherokee	*kuli.*	Cherokee	*uyawnung.*
Seneka	*uhkuah.*	Seneka	*konnonggah.*

English	walnut.
Cherokee	*sawhi.*
Mohawk	*oosoquah.*

IV. *The Athabaskan group.* — I find that the affinity between the Loucheux and the Kenay languages is given by Prichard, who, at the same time, separates both from the Athabaskan. "Mr. Gallatin says that the similarity of languages amongst all these" (*i. e.* the Athabaskan) "tribes is well-established. The Loucheux" "are excepted. This language does not appear to have any" "distinctly marked affinities except with that of the Kenay." — *Vol. V. p.* 377.

I believe that Dr. Prichard's informant on this point was the same as my own *i. e.* Mr. Isbister.

Scouler also suggests the same relationship.

That Buschmann has arrived at the results of his *Athabaskische Sprachstamm* through a series of independent researches I readily believe. Whether, after taking so little trouble to know what had been done by his predecessors, he is right is saying so much about his *discoveries* is another question.

That the Pinaleno is in the same category with the Navaho is shewn by Turner, who gives a vocabulary of the dialect.

English.	Navaho.	Pinaleno.
man	husttkin	payyahnah.
woman	estsanni	etsunni.
head	betsi	
hair	tchlit	setzezil.
ear	tshar	sitzchar.
eye	ninnar	tshindar.
nose	nitchi	chinchi.
hand	shilattaete	chicon.
feet	t'ki	sitzkay.
sun	dacos	yaheye.
moon	'tsadi	ilsonsayed.
star	olcheec	ailsonsatyou
fire	'tchou	
water	'thu	to.
earth	klish	tlia.
stone	tseck	tshaier.

V. *The Kitunaha language.* — The Kitunaha, Kútani, or Cootanie vocabulary of Mr. Hall was obtained from a Cree Indian, and is not to be depended on. This being the case it is fortunate that it not the only specimen of the language. There is an earlier one of Mr. Howse's, published in the Transactions of the Philological Society. It is as follows.

English.	Kútani.
one	hook cain.
two	ass.
three	calle sah.
four	had sah.
five	yea co.
six	in ne me sah.
seven	whist taw lah.
eight	waw ah sah
nine	ky yie kit to.
ten	aye to vow.
an Indian	ah quels mah kin nic.
a man	te te calt.
a woman	balle key.
a shoe	cath lend.
a gun	tah vow.
I	cah min.
thou	lin coo.
he	nin co is.
we (thou and I)	cah min nah lah.
this Indian	in nai ah quels mah kin nic.
that Indian	co ah quels mah kin nic.
these Indians	wai nai ah quels mah kin nic nin tie.
which man?	cath lah te te calt?
which Indians?	cah lah ah quels mah kin nic nin tie?
which gun?	cah lah tah vow?
who	cath lah.
my son	cah mah hat lay.
his son	hot lay is.
he is good	sook say.
it is good	sook kin nai.
he is arrived	swan hah.
I love him	hones sclah kilt.
he loves me	sclah kilt nai.
I see him	hones ze caught.
I see his son	hones ze caught ah calttis.
he sees me	ze caught tene.
he steals	i in ney.
I love him	hones sclah kilt ney.
I do not love him	cah sclah kilt nai.
my husband	can no claw kin nah.
he is asleep	come ney ney.
I am a man	te te calt ne ne.
I am a woman	balle key ne ne.
where?	cass kin?

English.	Kútani.
where is my gun?	cass kin cah tah vow?
where is his gun?	cass kin tah vow is?
a lake	ah co co nook.
how much?	cack sah?
it is cold weather	kis caw tit late.
a tent	ah caw slah co hoke.
my tent	cah ah kit lah.
thy tent	ah kit lah nis.
his tent	ah kit lah is.
our (thy and my) tent	cah ah kit lah nam.
yes	ah ah.
no	waw.
men	te te calt nin tie.
women	balle key nin tie.
girl (in her teens)	nah oh tit.
girls (in their teens)	nah oh tit nin tie.
boy	stalt.
boys	stalt nin tie.
little boy	stalt nah nah.
child	cah mo.
children	cah mo nin tie.
father (by the sons)	cah de doo.
father (by the daughters)	cah sous.
mother	cah mah.
brother, eldest	cah tat.
brother, youngest (by brothers)	cats zah.
brother, youngest (by sisters)	cah ze ah.
sister, eldest	cats sous.
sister, youngest	cah nah nah.
uncle	cath ah.
aunt	cah tilt tilt.
grandfather	cah papa.
grandmother	cah de de.
thy husband	in claw kin nah nis.
my wife	cah tilt nah mo.
thy wife	tilt nah mo nis.
son	can nah hot lay *or* ah calt.
daughter	cass win.
come here	clan nah.
go away	cloon no.
take care	ill kilt we in.
get out of the way	you vaw.
come in	tie cath ah min.
go out	sclah nah ah min.
stop	mae kaek.

English.	Kútani.
run	sin nack kin.
slowly	ah nis cah zin.
miserly	o per tin.
beggarly	coke co mac kah kan.
I give	hone silt ah mah tie sis ney.
thou givest	kin nah mah tie zey.
he gives	sclah mah tie zey.
he gave	cah mah tie cates.
I beat	hone cah slah tea.
thou beatest	kin cah slah leat.
he beats	kis kilt cone slah leat.
give me	ah mah tie kit sous.
he gave me	nah mah tie kit sap pe ney.
I love you	hone sclah kilt ney.
he loves	sclah kilt.
do you love me?	kin sclah slap?
I hate you	hone cah sclah kilt ney.
thou hatest	kin cah sclah kilt.
he hates	cah sclah kilt.
I speak	hones ah ney.
thou speakest	kins ah.
he speaks	kates ah.
we speak	hones ah nah slah.
you speak	talk e tea leat.
they speak	seals ah.
I steal	hone i he ne.
I sleep	hone come ney ney.
we sleep	hone come ney nah lah ney.
I die	hones alt hip pe ney.
thou diest	kins alt hip.
we die	hone ah o co noak nah slah ney.
give me to eat	he shoe.
eat	he ken.
my gun	cah tah vow.
thy gun	tah vow nis.
his gun	tah vow is.
mountain	ac co vo *cle it.*
rocky mountain	ac co vo *cle it* nook key.
snowy mountain	ac co vo *cle it* ac clo.
road or track	ac que mah nam.

English.	Kútani.
large river	cath le man me took.
small river	hah cack.
creek	nis cah took.
large lake	will caw ac co co nook.
small lake	ac co co nook nah nah.
rapid	ah cah hop *cle it.*
fall	wheat taw hop *cle it.*
shoals	ah coke you coo nook.
channel	hah cath slaw o weak.
wood or trees	ah kits slah in.
red pine	he mos.
cedar	heats ze natt.
poplar	ac cle mack.
aspin	ac co co zle mack.
fire	ah kin ne co co.
ice	ah co wheat
charcoal	ah kits cah kilt.
ashes	ah co que me co.
kettle	yeats skime.
mat tent	tah lalt ah kit lah nam.
head	ac clam.
eyes	ac cack leat.
nose	ac coun
mouth	ac cait le mah.
chin	ac cah me zin ne cack.
cheeks	ac que ma malt.
hair	ac coke *que slam.*
body	ac co no cack.
arms	ac sglat.
legs	ac sack.
belly	ac co womb.
back	ac cove cah slack.
side	ac kin no cack.
ears	ac coke co what.
animals	yah mo.
horse	kilt calt law ah shin.
stallion	cass co.
mare	stougalt.
bull	neel seck.
cow	slouke copo.
calf	ah kin co malt.
tiger	s'vie.
bears of all kinds	cap pe tie.
black or brown bears	nip pe co.

English.	Kútani.	English.	Kútani.
grizzle bear	kit slaw o slaw.	*crow*	coke kin.
rein deer	neats snap pie co.	*raven*	nah nah key.
red deer	kilt caw sley.	*snakes* (*rattle-snake*)	wilt le malt.
moose deer	snap pe co.	*garter snake*	ah co new slam.
woolverene	ats po.	*roots* (*camass*)	hap pey.
wolf	cack kin.	*bitter root*	nah cam me shou.
beaver	sin nah.	*tobacco root*	mass mass.
otter	ah cow oh alt	*sweet potatoes*	ah whis sea.
mink	in new yah.	*moose berry*	ac co mo.
martin	nac suck.	*strawberry*	ac co co.
musquash	an co.	*pipe*	couse.
small grey plain wolf	skin koots.	*pipe stem*	ac coot lah.
birds	to coots cah min nah.	*axe*	ah coot talt.
blue jay	co quis kay.	*tobacco*	yac ket.
		flesh	ah coot lack.

VI. *The Atna group.* — The numerous vocabularies that represent the dialects and sub-dialects of this large class are the following — Atna Proper or Shushwap, Kullelspelm (Pend d'oreilles), Spokan, Kettlefall dialects of the Selish; Okanagan; Skitsuish (Cœur d' alène); Piskwaus; Nusdalum; Squallyamish; Kawichen; Cathlascou; Cheeheeli; Tsihaili; Kwaintl; Kwenaiwitl; Kowelitz; Nsietshawus or Killamuk. To this, the present writer adds the Billechúla.

XI. The query as the likelihood of the Straits of Fuca vocabulary having been Mozino's finds place here. The two are different: though both may have been collected by Mozino. Each is to be found in Buschmann, who, exaggerating the isolation of Wakash, Nútka, and Tlaoquatch forms of speech, separates them too decidedly. Out of nineteen words compared nine are not only alike but admitted by him to be so.

The Billechula. — This lies intermediate to the Hailtsa and Atna groups; being (apparently) more akin to the latter than the former. Of the Atna dialects, it seems most to approach the Piskwaus.

The Chinuk. — The Chinuk of which the Watlala of Hale is variety is more like the Nsietashawus or Killamuk than aught else.

The Kalapuya. — The harshness of the Kalapuya is an inference from its orthography. It is said, however, to be soft and flowing *i. e.* more like the Sahaptin and Shoshoni in sound than the Chinuk, and Atna.

The Jakon. — This has affinities with the Chinuk on one side, and the Lutuami on the other; *i. e.* it is more like these two languages than any other. The likeness, however, is of the slightest.

MISCELLANEOUS AFFINITIES.

English	man.	Watlala	*tklaleq.*
Jakon	*kalt.*	Chinook	*waleq.*
Selish	*skalt-amekho.*	Chickaili	*khaaq.*
Skitsuish	*skailt emukh.*	Skwale	*stkltatkl-aidai.*
Piscous	*skaltamikho.*	Muskoghe	*okulosoha.*
English	woman.	*English*	child.
Jakon	*tklaks.*	Jakon	*mohaite.*
Wallawalla	*tilaki.*	Shahaptin	*miaots.*
Watlala	*tklkakilak.*		
Chinook	*tklakel.*	*English*	mother.
Cayoose	*pin-tkhlaiu.*	Jakon	*tkhla.*
Molele	*longi-tklai.*	Chinook	*tkhlianaa.*
Killamuk	*sui-tklats.*		
Shushwap	*somo-tklitçk.*	*English*	husband.
Cootanie	*pe-tklki.*	Jakon	*sonsit.*
		Chikaili	*çineis.*
English	boy.	Cowelitz	*skhon.*
Jakon	*tklom-kato.*	Killamuck	*ntsuon.*
Kizh	*kwiti.*	Umpqua	*skhon.*
Cowelitz	*kwaiitkl.*	– do.	*çhanga.*
English	girl.	*English*	wife.
Jakon	*tklaaksawa.*	Jakon	*sintkhlaks.*
Kizh	*takhai.*	Cayuse	*intkhlkaio.*
Satsikaa	*kokwa.*	Molele	*longitkhlai.*

The Sahaptin. — The Sahaptin, Shoshoni and Lutuami groups are more closely connected than the text makes them.

The Shoshoni (Paduca) group. — The best general name for this class is, in the mind of the present writer, Paduca; a name which was proposed by him soon after his notification of the affinity between the Shoshoni and the Comanch, in A. D. 1845. Until then, the two languages stood alone; *i. e.* there was no class at all. The Wihinast was shewn to be akin to the Shoshoni by Mr. Hale; the Wihinast vocabulary having been collected by that indefatigable philologue during the United States Exploring Expedition. In Gallatin's Report this affinity is put forward with due prominence; the Wihinast being spoken of as the Western Shoshoni.

In '50 the Report of the Secretary at War on the route from San Antonio to El Paso supplied an Utah vocabulary; which the paper of May '53 shews to be Paduca.

In the Report upon the Indian Tribes &c. of '55, we find the Chemehuevi, or the language of one of the *Pah-utah* bands "for the first time made public. It agrees" (writes Professor Turner) "with Simpson's Utah and Hale's East Shoshoni."

Carvalho (I quote from Buschmann) gives the numerals of the Piede (Pa-uta) of the Muddy River. They are nearly those of the Chemehuevi.

English.	Piede.
one	soos.
two	weïoone.
three	pioone.
four	wolsooing.
five	shoomin.
six	navi.
seven	navikavah.
eight	nanneëtsooïn.
nine	shookootspenkermi.
ten	tomshooïn.

For the Cahuillo see below.

Is the Kioway Paduca? The only known Kioway vocabulary is one published by Professor Turner in the Report just alluded to. It is followed by the remark that "a comparison of this vocabulary with those of the Shoshoni stock does, it is true, show a greater degree of resemblance than is to be found in any other direction. *The resemblance, however, is not sufficient to establish a radical affinity, but rather appears to be the consequence of long intercommunication.*"

For my own part I look upon the Kioway as Paduca — *the value of the class being raised.*

English.	Kioway.	English.	Kioway.
man	kiani.	*star*	tah.
woman	mayi.	*fire*	pia.
head	kiaku.	*water*	tu.
hair	ooto.	*I*	no.
face	caupa.	*thou*	am.
forehead	taupa.	*he*	kin.
ear	taati.	*we*	kime.
eye	taati.	*ye*	tusa.
nose	maucon.	*they*	cuta.
mouth	surol.	*one*	pahco.
tongue	den.	*two*	gia.
tooth	zun.	*three*	pao.
hand	mortay.	*four*	iaki.
foot	onsut.	*five*	onto.
blood	um.	*six*	mosso.
bone	tonsip.	*seven*	pantsa.
sky	kiacoh.	*eight*	iatsa.
sun	pai.	*nine*	cohtsu.
moon	pa.	*ten*	cokhi.

XIII. *The Capistrano group.* — Buschmann in his paper on the Netela and Kizh states, after Mofras, that the Juyubit, the Caguilla, and the Sibapot tribes belong to the Mission of St. Gabriel. Turner gives a Cahuillo, or Cawio, vocabulary. The district from which it was taken belonged to the St. Gabriel district. The Indian, however, who supplied it had lived with the priests of San Luis Rey, until the break-up of the Mission.

Whether the form of speech he has given us be that of the Mission in which he lived or that of the true Cahuillo district is uncertain. Turner treats it as Cahuillo; at the same time he remarks, and shews, that it is more akin to the San Luis Rey dialect than to any other.

But it is also akin to the Chemeuevi, which with it is tabulated; a fact which favours the views of Hale respecting its San Capistrano affinities rather than those of Buschmann — Hale making them Paduca.

A vocabulary, however, of the unreclaimed Cahuillo tribes —the tribes of the mountains as opposed to the missions — is still wanted.

English.	Chemuhuevi.	Cahuillo.
man	tawatz	nahanes.
woman	maruqua	nikil.
head	mutacowa	niyuluka.
hair	torpip	piiki.
face	cobanim	nepush.
ear	nancaba	nanocka.
eye	puoui	napush.
nose	muvi	nemu.
mouth	timpouo	netama.
tongue	ago	nenun.
tooth	towwa	netama.
hand	masiwanim	nemohemosh.
foot	nampan	neik.
bone	maiigan	neta.
blood	paipi	neo.
sky	tuup	tuquashanica.
sun	tabaputz	tamit.
moon	meagoropitz	menyil.
star	putsih	chehiam.
fire	cun	cut.
water	pah	pal.
one	shuish	supli.
two	waii	mewi.
three	paii	mepai.
four	watchu	mewitchu.
five	manu	nomequadnun.
six	nabai	quadnunsupli.
seven	moquist	quanmunwi.
eight	natch	quanmunpa.
nine	uwip	quanmunwichu.
ten	mashu	nomachumi.

P. 353. Now comes the correction of a statement in p. 353 ——— "*the language of San Luis El Rey which is Yuma, is succeeded by that of San Luis Obispo, which is Capistrano.*" — This is an inaccuracy; apparently from inadversion. A reference to the Paternosters of *pp.* 304 — 305 shews that the San Luis Rey, and the San Juan Capistrano forms of speech are closely allied.

Meanwhile, the San Fernando approaches the San Gabriel, *i. e.* the Kizh.

See also Turner, *p.* 77 — where the name *Kechi* seems, word for word, to be *Kizh*. The *Kizh*, however is a *San Gabriel* form of speech.

XIV. *The Yuma group.* — Turner gives a Mojave, or Mohavi vocabulary; the first ever published. It is stated and shewn to be Yuma. The Yabipai, in the same paper, is inferred to be Yuma; containing, as it does, the word

hanna = *good* = *hanna*, *Dieguno.*
n'yatz = *I* = *nyat*, *do.*
pook = *beads* = *pook*, *Cuchan.*

The Mohave vocabulary gives the following extracts.

English.	Mohave.	Cuchan.	Dieguno.	Cocomancopa.
man	ipah	ipatsh	aykutshet	ipatshe.
woman	sinyax	sinyak	sin	sinchayaixhutsh.
head	cawawa	umwhelthe	estar	
hair	imi	ocono		
face	ihalimi	edotshe	wa	
forehead	yamapul	iyucoloque		
ear	esmailk	smythl	hamatl	
eye	idotz	edotshii	awuc	ayedotsh.
nose	ihu	ehotshi	hu	yayyayooche.
mouth	ia	iyuquaofe	ah	izatsh.
tongue	ipailya	epulche		
tooth	ido	aredoche		
hand		isalche	sithl	
arm	isail			
foot	imilapilap	imetshshpaslapyah	hamilyah	
blood	niawhut	awhut		
sky	amaiiga	ammai		
sun	nyatz	nyatsh	nyatz	
moon	hullya	huthlya	hullash	
star	hamuse	klupwataie	hummashish	
		hutshar		
fire	awa	aawo		ahúch.
water	aha	aha	aha	
I	nyatz	nyat	nyat	inyatz.
thou	mantz	mantz		mantz.
he	pepa	habuisk	pu	
one	setto	sin	hini	
two	havika	havik	hawuk	
three	hamoko	hamok	hamuk	
four	pinepapa	chapop	chapop	
five	serapa	serap	serap	
six	sinta	humhúk		
seven	vika	pathkaie		
eight	muka	chiphuk		
nine	pai	hummamuk		
ten	arapa	sahhuk		

We leave California with the remark that in Ludwig's Literature of the American Aboriginal Languages Mr. Bartlett's vocabularies for California bear the following titles.

1. Dieguno or Comeyei,
2. Kechi,
3. San Luis Obispo,
4. Il'hana
5. Tehama
6. Coluz
7. Noana
8. Diggers

} from the drainage of the Sacrament,

9. Diggers of Napa Valley.
10. Makaw of Upper California.

See *Californians.*

There is also a Piros vocabulary for the parts about El Paso: also a notice (under the word) that the MUTSUNES Indians speak a dialect of the Soledad.

Old California. — As a general rule, translations of the Pater Noster shew difference rather than likeness: in other words, as a general rule, rude languages are more alike than then Pater Nosters make them. The reasons for this lie in the abstract nature of many of the ideas which it is necessary to express; but for the expression whereof the more barbarous forms of speech are insufficient.

This creates the necessity for circumlocutions and other expedients. In no part of the world is this more manifest than in Old California; a district for which our *data* are of the scantiest. I think, however, that they are sufficient to shew that the Northern forms of speech, at least, are Yuma.

ENGLISH.	O. CALIFORNIAN.	YUMA.
man (homo)	tama	epatsh.
man (vir)	uami	
woman	wuctu	seenyack.
	wakoe	sinyax.
	huagin	seen.
child	whanu	hailpit.
	wakna	
father	iham	lothmocul.
	kakka	niquioche.
	keneda	nile.
	kanamba	
mother	nada	tile.
son	uisaiham	homaie.
sister	kenassa	amyuck.
head	agoppi	estar.
eye	aribika	ayon.
tongue	*mabela*	*ipailya — Mohave.*
hand	nagana	sith'l

English.	N. Californian.	Yuma.
foot	agannapa	hameelyay.
sky	*ambeink*	*ammaya — Mohave.*
earth	*amet*.....	*omut — Cuchan.*
.....	.....	*ammartar — Mohave.*
water	*kahal*	*aha — Dieguno.*
... .	....	*ahha — Mohave.*
fire	*usi*.....	*house — Cocomaricopa.*
sun	ibo	nyatz.
day	ibo	nomasup.
moon.....	gomma	hullya.
.....	ganehmajeie	.....

The Pima group. — One of Mr. Bartlett's vocabularies is of the Opata form of speech. (*Ludwig.*)

Tequima, according to the same authority is another name for the same language: in which there is a vocabulary by Natal Lombardo; Mexico. 1702, as well as an *Arte de la Lengua Tequima, vulgarmente llamada Opata.*

A *Vocabulario de las Lenguas Pima, Eudeve, y Seris* is said, by De Souza, to have been written by Fr. Adamo Gilo a Jesuit missionary in California. — Ditto — *v.* Pima.

Exceptions, which the present writer overlooked, are taken in the Mithridates to the statement that the Opata and Eudeve Pater-nosters represent the Pima Proper. They agree with a third language from the Pima country — but this is not, necessarily, the Pima. Hence, what applies to the *Pimerian* may or may not apply to the Pima Proper.

Nevertheless, the Pima belongs to the same class — being, apparently, more especially akin to the Tarahumara. I have only before me the following Tarahumara words (*i. e.* the specimens in the Mithridates) through which the comparison can be made. They give, however, thus much in way of likeness and difference.

English.	Tarahumara.	Pima.
man	rehoje	orter.
.....	tehoje	checort.
.....	.....	huth.
woman ...	muki	oo oove.
.....	.....	hahri.
wife	*upi*	*oo-if.*
head	*moóla*.....	*mouk.*
eye.....	pusiki	oupewe.
tongue ...	tenila.....	neneu.
hair	quitshila	moh.
.....	.....	ptmuk.
foot	tala	tetaght.
fire.....	naiki.....	tahi.
sun.....	*taica*	*taks.*
.....	.....	*tasch.*

English.	Tarahumara.	Pima.
moon	*maitsaca*	*mahsa.*
.....	.....	*massar.*
I.....	nepe	ahan.
two.....	*guoca*	*coka.*
....	*oca*.....	*kuak.*

Buschmann connects the Pima with the Tepeguana.

Another complication. — In Turner's Extract from a MS. account of the Indians of the Northern Provinces of New Spain I find that Opa (Opata?) is another name for the Cocomaricopas *whose language is that of the Yuma.* This is true enough — but is the Opata more Yuma than the text (which connects it with the Hiaqui &c.) makes it?

The Pima, Hiaqui, Tubar, Tarahumara, and Cora as a class.— An exception to the text is indicated by the footnote of page 357. The Mithridates connects the Cora and Tarahumara with the Astek and with each other. The Astek elements of the Hiaqui, as indicated by Ribas are especially alluded to. So are the Tarahumara affinities of the Opata. All this is doing as much in the way of classification as is done by the present author — as much or more.

As much, or more, too is done by Buschmann; who out of the Cora, Tarahumara, Tepeguana and Cahita (the latter a representation of the section to which the Yaqui belongs) makes his *Sonora Class — Sonorischer Sprachstamm.* As a somewhat abnormal member of this he admits the Pima.

Of the Guazave there is a MS. *Arte* by P. Fernando Villapane — *Ludwig.*

That the *data* for the Tepeguana are better than the text makes them has already been suggested. Buschmann has used materials unknown to the present writer.

See Ludwig *in voc. Tepeguana.*

Pirinda and Tarasca. — The statement that there is a Pirinda grammar is inaccurate. There is one of the Tarasca; to which the reader is referred.

But this is not all. Under the title Pirinda in Ludwig we find that De Souza says of Fr. Juan Bravo, the author of a grammar of the Lengua Tarasca "*fue maestro peritissimo de la lengua Pirinda llamada Tarasca.*" This makes the two languages much more alike than the present paper makes them. The present paper, however, rests on the Pater-nosters. How inconclusive they are has already been indicated.

[P The following table, the result of a very limited collation gives some miscellaneous affinities for the Otomi.

English ..... man.
Otomi ..... *nanyehe.*
Maya &c. ..... *uinic.*
Paduca ..... *wensh.*

English ..... woman.
Otomi ..... *danxu.*
Maya ..... *atan=wife.*

English ..... woman.
Otomi ..... *nsu.*
Talatui..... *essee.*

English ..... hand.
Otomi ..... *ye.*
Talatui..... *iku.*

English ..... foot.
Otomi ..... *qua.*
Maya &c. ..... *oc.*

English ..... blood.
Otomi ..... *qhi.*
Maya &c. ..... *kik.*

English ..... hair.
Otomi ..... *si.*
S. Miguel..... *te-asa-kho.*

English ..... ear.
Otomi ..... *gu.*
S. Miguel..... *tent-khi-to.*

English ..... tooth.
Otomi ..... *tsi.*
Attacapa ..... *ods.*

English ..... head.
Otomi ..... *na.*
Sekumne ..... *ono=hair.*

English ..... fire.
Otomi ..... *tziɓi.*
Pujune..... *ça.*

English ..... moon.
Otomi ..... *tzona.*
Kenay ..... *ssin=star.*

English ..... stone.
Otomi ..... *do.*
Cumanch ..... *too-mepee.*

English ..... winter.
Otomi ..... *tzaa.*
Cumanch ..... *otsa-inte.*
S. Gabriel ... *otso.*

English ..... fish.
Otomi ..... *hua.*
Maya &c. ..... *cay.*

English ..... bird.
Otomi ..... *ttzintzy.*
Maya &c. ..... *tchitch.*

English ..... egg.
Otomi ..... *mado.*
Poconchi..... *molo.*

English ..... lake.
Otomi ..... *mohe.*
Pima..... *vo.*

English ..... sea.
Otomi ..... *muuthe.*
U. Sac. &c. ... *muni=water.*

English ..... son.
Otomi ..... *tsi.*
..... *ti.*
..... *batsi.*
..... *iso.*
Natchez ..... *tsitsce=child.*

English ..... meat.
Otomi ..... *nhihuni.*
..... *ngoe=flesh.*
Mexican ..... *nacatl=flesh.*

English ..... eat.
Otomi ..... *tsa.*
Talatui..... *tsamak.*

English ..... good.
Otomi ..... *manho.*
Sekumne ..... *wenne.*

English ..... rabbit.
Otomi ..... *qhua.*
Huasteca ..... *coy.*

English ..... snake.
Otomi ..... *qqcna.*
Maya..... *can.*

English ..... yes.
Otomi ..... *ha.*
Cumanch..... *haa.*

English ..... three.
Otomi ..... *hiu.*
Mexican ..... *yey.*
Huasteca..... *okh.*

The other two are as follows.

(2.)

The Otomi with the languages akin to the Chinese en masse.

English ..... man.
Otomi ..... *nanyehe.*
Kuanchua ... *nan.*
Canton..... *nam.*
Tonkin..... *nam.*

English ..... woman.
Otomi ..... *nitsu.*
..... *nsu.*
Kuanchua ... *niu.*
Canton ..... *niu.*
Tonkin..... *nu.*

English ..... son.
Otomi ..... *batsi.*
..... *iso.*
Kuanchua ... *dsu.*
Canton..... *dzi.*
Mian..... *sa.*
Maplu ..... *possa.*
Play ..... *aposo.*
..... *naputhæ.*
Passuko ..... *posaho.*

English ..... hand.
Otomi ..... *ye.*
Siuanlo..... *he.*
Cochin China *ua = arm.*

English ..... foot.
Otomi ..... *gua.*
Pey ..... *ha = leg.*
Pape..... *ha, ho = do.*
Kuanchua ... *kio.*
Canton..... *koh.*
Moitay..... *kcho.*

English ..... bird.
Otomi ..... *tzintey.*
Maya..... *chechetch.*
Tonkin..... *tcheni.*
Cochin China *tching.*

English ..... sun.
Otomi ..... *hiadi.*
Canton..... *yat.*

English ..... moon.
Otomi ..... *rzana.*
Siuanlo ..... *dzan.*
Teina ..... *son.*

English ..... star.
Otomi ..... *tze.*

Tonkin..... *sao.*
Cochin China *sao.*
Maplu ..... *shia.*
Play ..... *shâ.*
..... *sha.*
Passuko ..... *za.*
Colaun..... *assa.*

English ..... water.
Otomi ..... *dehe.*
Tibet..... *tchi.*
Mian..... *zhe.*
Maplu ..... *ti.*
Colaun..... *tui.*

English ..... stone.
Otomi ..... *do.*
Cochin China *ta.*
Tibet..... *rto.*

English ..... rain.
Otomi ..... *ye.*
Chuanchua... *yu.*
Canton ..... *yu.*
Colaun..... *yu.*

English ..... fish.
Otomi ..... *hua.*
Chuanchua... *yu.*
Canton..... *yu.*
Tonkin..... *ka.*
Cochin China *ka.*
Play ..... *ya.*
Moan ..... *ka.*

English ..... good.
Otomi ..... *manho.*
Teilung..... *wanu.*

English ..... bad.
Otomi ..... *hing.*
..... *hio.*
Chuanchua... *o.*
Tonkin..... *hu.*
Play ..... *gyia.*

English ..... great.
Otomi ..... *nah.*
..... *nde.*
..... *nohoc.*
Chinese ..... *ta, da.*
Anam ..... *dai.*
Play ..... *do, uddo.*
Pey ..... *nio.*

English	small.	Tibet	*shie.*
Otomi	*ttygi.*	Mian	*tsha.*
Passuko	*tcheka.*	Myamma	*sa.*
English	eat.	*English*	sleep.
Otomi	*tze tza.*	Otomi	*aha.*
Chinese	*shi.*	Chuanchua ...	*wo*, *uo.*

(2.)

The Maya, with the languages akin to the Chinese en masse.

English	son.	*English*	moon.
Maya	*lakpal.*	Maya	*u.*
.....	*palal*=*children.*	Chuanchua ...	*yue.*
Myamma	*lugala.*		
Teilung	*lukwun.*	*English*	star.
		Maya	*ek.*
English	head.	Mean	*kie.*
Maya	*pol*, *hool.*	Miamma	*kyi.*
Kalaun	*mollu.*		
		English	water.
English	mouth.	Maya	*ha.*
Maya	*chi.*	Miamma	*ya.*
Chuanchua ...	*keu.*		
Canton	*hou.*	*English*	rain.
Tonkin	*kau.*	Maya	*chaac.*
Cochin China	*kau.*	Maplu	*tchatchang.*
Tibet	*ka.*	Passuko	*tatchu.*
		English	small.
English	hand.	Maya	*mehen.*
Maya	*cab.*	Tonkin	*mon.*
Huasteca	*cubac.*		
Maplu	*tchoobah*=*arm.*	*English*	eat.
Play	*tchoobah*=*do.*	Maya	*hanal.*
Passuko	*tchoobawh*=*do.*	Tonkin	*an.*
		Play	*ang.*
English	foot.		
Maya	*uoc*, *oc.*	*English*	bird.
Chuanchua ...	*kio.*	Maya	*chechitch.*
Canton	*kon.*	Tonkin	*tchim.*
Moitay	*cho.*		
		English	fish.
English	sun.	Maya	*ca.*
Maya	*kin.*	Tonkin	*ka.*
Colaun	*koni.*		
Moan	*knua.*	*English*	great.
Teiya	*kawan.*	Maya	*noh.*
Teilung	*kangnn.*	Pey	*nio.*
Pey	*kanguan.*		

The Acoma. — Two vocabularies from a tribe from the Pueblo of San Domingo, calling themselves Kiwomi, and a third of the Cochitemi dialect, collected by Whipple, are compared, by Turner, with the Acoma, of which they are dialects. Turner proposes the names Keres for the group. Buschmann, writing

after him, says, "I name this form of speech *Quera*" — "*ich nenne dies Idiom Quera.*"

The notice of the "outward signs" is not so clear as it should be. It means that two of the languages, the Taos and Zuni, run into polysyllabic forms — probably (indeed almost certainly) from composition or inflexion; whereas the Tesuque (which is placed in *contrast* with the Zuni) has almost a monosyllabic appearance. This phenomenon appears elsewhere; *e. g.* in the Attacapa, as compared with the tongues of its neighbourhood. Upon the whole, the Zuni seems to be most aberrant of the group — saving the Moqui, which has decided Paduca affinities. They are all, however, mutually unintelligible; though the differences between them may easily be over-valued.

English.	Acoma.	Cochetime.	Kiwomi.
man	hahtrat-e	hachthe	hatshthe.
woman	cuhu	coyoni	cuyauwi.
hair	hahtratni		hatre.
head	nushkaine		nashke.
face	howawinni		skeeowa.
eye	hoonaine		shaana.
nose	ouisuine		wieshin.
mouth	ouicani		chiaca.
tongue	watchhuntni		watshin.
one		ishka	isk.
two		knomi	'tuomi.
three		chami	tshabi.
four		kiana	kiana.
five		tama	taoma.
six		chisa	chisth.
seven		maicana	maichana.
eight		cocomishia	cocumshi.
nine		maeco	maieco.
ten		'tkatz	cahtz.

Texas. — *p.* 101. — "Ini and Tachi are expressly stated to be Caddo, &c. as it is from the name of the last that the word *Texas* is derived &c." — The name *Teguas* is a name (other than native) of the population which calls itself Kiwomi. Word for word, this may (or may not) be Taos. It is only necessary to remember the complication here indicated. The exact tribe which gave the name to Texas has yet to be determined.

The Witshita. — Allied to one another the Kechis and Wacos (Huecos) are, also, allied to the Witshita. — *See Turner. p.* 68.

English.	Kichai.	Hueco.
man	caiuquanoquts	todekitz.
woman	chequoike	cahheie.
head	quitatso	atskiestacat.
hair	itscoso	ishkesteatz.
face	itscot	ichcoh.

English.	Kichai.	Hueco.
ear	atikoroso	ortz.
eye	quideeco	kidik.
nose	chuscarao	tisk.
mouth	hokinnik	ahcok.
tongue	hahtok	hotz.
tooth	athnesho	ahtk.
hand	ichshene	ishk'ti.
foot	usinic	os.
fire	yecenieto	hatz.
water	kiokoh	kitsah.
one	arishco	cheos.
two	chosho	witz.
three	tahwithco	tow.
four	kithnucote	tahquitz.
five	xs'toweo	ishquitz.
six	nahitow	kiash.
seven	tsowetate	kiowhitz.
eight	naikinukate	kiatou.
nine	taniorokat	choskitte.
ten	x'skani	skittewas.

Turner makes these three languages Pawni. In the present text the Witshita is made Caddo. It is made so on the strength of the numerals — perhaps overhastily.

That a language may be Pawni without ceasing to be Caddo, and Caddo without losing its place in the Pawni group is suggested in the beginning of the paper. Turner's table (p. 70), short as it is, encourages this view.

The truth is that the importance of the Caddos and Pawnis, from an ethnological point of view, is inordinately greater than their importance in any other respect. They are, however, but imperfectly known.

In Gallatin's first paper — the paper of the Archæologia Americana — there is a Caddo vocabulary and a Pawni vocabulary; and all that be said of them is that they are a little more like each other, than they are to the remaining specimens.

When the paper under notice was published the Riccaree was wholly unknown. But the Riccaree, when known, was shewn to be more Pawni than aught else. This made the Pawni a kind of nucleus for a class.

Somewhat later the Caddo confederacy in Texas took prominence, and the Caddo became a nucleus also.

The true explanation of this lies in the highly probably fact that both the Caddo and Pawni are members of one and the same class. At the same time I am quite prepared to find that the Witshita (though compared with the Caddo by myself) is more particularly Pawni.

That the nearest congeners of the Caddo and Pawni class were the members of the Iroquois, Woccoon, Cherokee, and

Chocta group I believed at an early period of my investigations; at a time (so to say) before the Riccarees, and the Californian populations were invented. If this doctrine were true, the Caddo (Pawni) affinities would run eastwards. They may do this, and run westwards also. That they run eastwards I still believe. But I have also seen Caddo and Pawni affinities in California. The Caddo numeral *one* = *whiste;* in Secumne and Cushna *wikte*, *wiktem*. Again the Caddo and Kichie for *water* = *koko*, *kioksh*. Meanwhile *kik* is a true Moquelumne form. This I get from a most cursory inspection; or rather from memory.

Upon the principle that truth comes out of error more easily than confusion I give the following notice of the distribution or want of distribution of the numerous Texian tribes.

1. *Coshattas — Unknown.
2. Towiach — Pawni (?).
3. Lipan — Athabaskan (?).
4. *Alish, or Eyish — Caddo (?).
5. *Acossesaw — Unknown.
6. Navaosos — Navahos (?).
7. *Mayes — Attacapa (?).
8. *Cances — Unknown.
9. Toncahuas — Are these the Tonkaways, amounting, according to Stem, to 1152 souls? If so, a specimen of their language should be obtained. Again — are they the Tancards? Are they the Tunicas? If so, they may speak Choctah.
10. Tuhuktukis — Are these the Topofkis, amounting to 200 souls? If so a specimen of their language, *eo nomine*, is attainable.
11. Unataquas, or Andarcos — They amount, according to Stem, to 202 souls. No vocabulary, *eo nomine*, known. Capable of being obtained.
12. Mascovie — Unknown.
13. Iawani or Ioni — Caddo? Amount to 113 souls. Specimen of language, *eo nomine*, capable of being obtained.
14. Waco — Wico? — Pawni.
15. *Avoyelle — Unknown.
16. 17. Washita — Kiche — Pawni.
18. *Xaramene — Unknown.
19. *Caicache — Unknown.
20. *Bidias — Unknown.
21. Caddo — Caddo.
22. Attacapa — Attacapa.
23. Adahi — Adahi.
24. Coke — Caraekahua.
25. Carankahua — Attacapa (?).

26. Towacano — Numbering 141 souls. Is this Towiach?
27. Hitchi — Kichi (?).
28. *Nandako. } Caddo (?)
29. *Nabadaches. }
30. *Yatassi.
31. *Natchitoches. }
32. *Nacogdoches. } Adahi (?).
33. Keyes. }

These last may belong as much to Louisiana as to Texas — as, indeed, may some of the others. Those marked * are apparently extinct. At any rate, they are not found in any of the recent notices.

Finally, Mr Burnett mentions the San Pedro Indians.

The previous list shews that the obliteration of the original tribes of Texas has been very great. It shews us this at the first view. But a little reflection tells us something more.

Like Kanzas and Nebraska, Texas seems to have scarcely any language that is peculiar to itself; in this respect standing in strong contrast to California. The Caddo belongs to the frontier. The Pawni forms of speech occur elsewhere. The Adahi is probaly as much the property of Louisiana as of Texas. The Cumanch, Chocta &c. are decidedly intrusive. The nearest approach to a true Texian form of speech is the Attacapa. No wonder it is isolated.

The Adahi, is has, at least the following affinities.

English	man.
Adahi	*haasing.*
Otto	*wahsheegae.*
Onondago ...	*etschinak.*
Abenaki	*seenanbe=vir.*
,, ...	*arenanbe=homo.*
English	woman.
Adahi	*quaechake.*
Muskoge	*hoktie.*
Choctah	*hottokohyo.*
Osage	*wako.*
Sack and Fox	*kwyokih.*
Ilinois	*ickoe.*
Nanticoke ...	*acquahique.*
Delaware	*okhqueh.*
Algonkin. &c.	*squaw.*
Taculli	*chaca.*
English	girl.
Adahi	*quoâtwistuck.*
Chikkasaw ..	*take.*
Choctah	*villa tak.*
Caddo	*nuttaitesseh.*
Oneida	*caidazai.*
Micmac	*epidek.*
English	child.
Adahi	*tattahening.*
,, ...	*tattahache=boy.*
Omahaw	*shinga shinga.*
Otto	*cheechinga.*
Quappa	*shetyinka.*
English	father.
Adahi	*kewanick.*
Chetimacha ..	*kineghie.*
Chikkasaw ...	*unky.*
Choctah	*aunkke.*
English	mother.
Adahi	*amanic.*
Caddo	*ehneh.*
Sioux	*enah, eehong.*

Tuscarora ..... *æna.*
Wyandot ..... *aneheh.*
Kenev ..... *anna.*
Eskimo ..... *amama.*

English ..... husband.
Adahi ..... *hasekino.*
Chetimacha ..... *kichehase.*
Winebago ..... *eekunah.*
Taculli ..... *eki.*
Tchuktchi ..... *uika.*

English ..... wife.
Adahi ..... *quochekinok.*
,, ... *quaechuke = woman.*
Tuscarora ..... *ekening = do.*
Cherokee ..... *ageyung = woman.*
Chetimacha ..... *kichekithia.*
,, ... *kichehase = man.*

English ..... son.
Adahi ..... *tallehennie.*
Caddo ..... *hininshatrseh.*
Omahaw ..... *eeingyai.*
Minetare ..... *eejinggai.*
Winebago ..... *eeneek.*
Oneida ..... *yung.*

English ..... brother.
Adahi ..... *gasing.*
Salish ..... *asintzah*
Ottawa ..... *sayin = elder.*
Ojibbeway ..... *osy aiema.*

English ..... head.
Adahi ..... *tochake.*
Caddo ..... *dachunkea = face.*
,, ... *dokundsa.*

English ..... hair.
Adahi ..... *calatuck.*
Chippewyan ..... *thiegah.*
Kenay ..... *szugo.*
Miami ..... *keelingeh = face.*

English ..... face.
Adahi ..... *annack.*
Chetimacha ..... *kaneketa.*
Attacapa ..... *iune.*
Eskimo ..... *keniak.*

English ..... ear.
Adahi ..... *calat.*
Cherokee ..... *gule.*
Passamaquoddy *chalksee.*

English ..... nose.
Adahi ..... *wecoocat.*

Montaug ..... *cochoy.*
Micmac ..... *uchichun.*

English ..... beard.
Adahi ..... *tosocat.*
Attacapa ..... *taesh = hair.*
Nachez ..... *ptsasong = hair.*
Chetimacha ..... *chattie.*

English ..... arm.
Adahi ..... *walcat.*
Taculli ..... *olâ.*
Chippewyan ... *law.*

English ..... nails.
Adahi ..... *sicksapasca.*
Catawba ..... *ecksapeeah = hand.*
Natchez ..... *ispehse = hand.*

English ..... belly.
Adahi ..... *noeyack.*
Winebago ..... *neehahhah*
Eskimo ..... *neiyuk.*

English ..... leg.
Adahi ..... *ahasuck = leg.*
Chetimacha ..... *sauknuthe = feet.*
,, ... *saukatie = toes.*
,, ... *sau = leg.*
Osage ..... *sagaugh.*
Yancton ..... *hoo.*
Otto ..... *hoo.*
Pawnee ..... *ashoo = foot.*
Sioux ..... *see, seehah = do.*
Nottoway ..... *saseeke = do.*
Dacota ..... *seehukasa = toes.*
Nottoway ..... *seeke = do.*

English ..... mouth.
Adahi ..... *wacatcholak.*
Chetimacha ..... *cha.*
Attacapa ..... *katt.*
Caddo ..... *dunehwatcha.*
Natchez ..... *heche.*
Mohawk ..... *wachsacarlunt.*
Seneca ..... *wachsagaint.*
Sack and Fox .. *wekṭoneh.*
Mohican ..... *otoun.*

English ..... tongue.
Adahi ..... *tenanat.*
Chetimacha ..... *huene.*
Uché ..... *cootincah.*
Choctah ..... *issoonlush.*
Knistenaux ..... *otayenee.*
Ojibbeway ..... *otainani.*
Ottawa ..... *tenanian.*

English	hand.
Adahi.....	*secut.*
,, ...	*sicksapasca=nails.*
Choctah	*shukba=his arm.*
Chikkasaw	*shukbah=do.*
Muskoge	*sakpa=do.*
Kenay	*skona.*
Attacapa	*nishagg=fingers.*
Omahaw	*shagai.*
Osage.....	*shagah.*
Mohawk	*shake.*
Yancton	*shakai=nails.*
Otto	*shagai=do.*

English	blood.
Adahi.....	*pchack.*
Caddo	*baaho.*
Passamaquoddy	*pocagun.*
Abenaki	*bagakkaan.*
Mohican	*pocaghkan.*
Nanticoke	*puckcuckque.*
Miami	*nihpeekanueh.*

English	red.
Adahi.....	*pechasat.*
Natchez.....	*pahkop.*

English	feet.
Adahi.....	*nocat.*
Micmac.....	*ukkuat.*
Miami	*katah.*
Taculli	*oca.*
Chippewyan ...	*cuh.*
Ilinois	*nickahta=leg.*
Delaware	*wikhaat=do.*
Massachusetts	*muhkout=do.*
Ojibbeway	*okat=do.*

English	bone.
Adahi	*wahacut.*
Otto	*wahoo.*
Yancton	*hoo.*
Dacota	*hoohoo.*
Ojibbeway	*okun.*
Miami	*kaanih.*
Eskimo	*heownik.*
,, ...	*oaccyak.*

English	house.
Adahi	*coochut.*
Nachez	*hahit.*
Muskoge	*chookgaw.*
Choctah	*chukka.*
Catawba	*sook.*
Taculli	*yock.*

English	bread.
Adahi.....	*okhapin.*
Chetimacha.....	*hcichepat chepa.*

English	sky.
Adahi	*ganick.*
Seneca	*kiunyage.*

English	summer.
Adahi.....	*weetsuck.*
Uché	*waitee.*

English	fire.
Adahi.....	*nang.*
Caddo	*nako.*
Eskimo	*ignuck.*
,, ...	*eknok.*
,, ...	*annak.*

English	mountain.
Adahi	*tolola.*
Taculli	*chell.*

English	stone, rock.
Adahi.....	*ekseka.*
Caddo	*seeeeko.*
Nachez	*ohk.*

English	maize.
Adahi.....	*ocasuck.*
Nachez	*hokko.*

English	day.
Adahi.....	*nestach.*
Muskoge	*nittah.*
Chikkasaw	*nittuck.*
Choctah.....	*nittok.*

English	autumn.
Adahi.....	*hustalneetsuck.*
Choctah	*hushtolape.*
Chikkasaw	*hustillomona.*
,, ...	*hustola=winter.*

English	bird.
Adahi.....	*washang.*
Choctah	*hushe.*
Sack and Fox...	*wishkamon.*
Shawnoe	*wiskiluthi.*

English	goose.
Adahi.....	*nickkuicka.*
Chetimacha.....	*napiche.*
Ilinois	*nicak.*
Ojibbeway	*nickak.*
Delaware	*kaak.*
Shawnoe	*neeake.*

English	duck.
Adahi.....	*ahuck.*
Eskimo	*ewuck.*
English	fish.
Adahi.....	*aesut.*
Cherokee	*atsatih.*
English	tree.
Adahi.....	*tanavk.*
Dacota	*tschang.*
Ilinois	*toauane.*
Miami	*tauaneh = wood.*
English	grass.
Adahi	*hasack.*
Chikkasaw	*hasook.*
Choctah	*hushehuck.*
Uché	*yahsuh = leaf.*
Chikkasaw	*hishe = do.*
English	deer.
Adahi.....	*wakhine.*
Uché	*wayung.*
English	squirrel.
Adahi.....	*enack.*
Sack and Fox...	*aneekwah.*
Nanticoke	*nowckkey.*
Abenaki	*anikesses.*
Knistenaux	*annickochas.*
English	old.
Adahi.....	*hansnaie*
Caddo	*hunaisteteh.*
Nottoway.....	*onahahe.*
English	good.
Adahi.....	*awiste.*
Dacota	*haywashta.*
Yancton.....	*washtai.*
English	1.
Adahi.....	*nassicon.*
Cherokee	*naski.*
English	kill.
Adahi.....	*yoeick.*
Caddo	*yokay.*
Catawba	*eekway.*
English	two.
Adahi.....	*nass.*
Algonkin, &c. ...	*nis*, *ness*, *nees.*

Mexico-Guatemala. — The details of the languages of Mexico and Guatemala that are neither Mexican Proper (Astek) or Maya are difficult. Availing myself of the information afforded by my friend Mr. Squier, and the bibliographical learning of Ludwig, I am inclined to believe

1. That all the following forms of speech are Maya; viz. Chiapa, Tzendal (Celdal), Chorti, Mam, Pocoman (Poconchi), Populuca, Quiche, Kachiquel, Zutugil (Yutukil), Huasteca.

2. That the Zoque, Utlateca, and Lacondona may or may not be Maya.

3. That the Totanaca; and

4. The Mixteca are other than Maya.

5. That, if the statement of Hervas be correct, the Zapoteca, the Mazateca, the Chinansteca, and the Mixe are in the same category.

The Tlapaneka according to Humboldt is a peculiar language. — *Ludwig in voc.*

I have done, however, little or nothing, in the way of first hand work with the languages to the South of Sinaloa and the West of Texas. I therefore leave them — leave them with a reference to Ludwig's valuable Bibliotheca Glottica, for a correction of my statement respecting the non-existence of any Indian forms of speech in New Grenada. The notices under *v. v.* ANDAQUIES,

Coconucos, Correquajes, Guaques, Inganos, will shew that this is far from being the case.

The present paper has gone over so large a portion of North America that it is a pity not to go over the remainder. The ethnology of the Canada, and the British possessions akin to Canada contains little which is neither Eskimo or Algonkin, Iroquois or Athabaskan. Of new forms of speech like those of which Oregon and California have given so many instances it exhibits none. Everything belongs to one of the four above-named classes. The Bethuck of Newfoundland was Algonkin, and so were the Blackfoot, the Shyenne and Arrapaho. Indeed, as has been already stated, the Eskimo and Athabaskan stretch across the Continent. The Blackfoot touches the Rocky Mountains. Of the Sioux class the British possessions shew a sample. The Red River district is Assineboin; the Assineboins being Sioux. So are a few other British tribes.

Upon the whole, however, five well-known families give us all that belong to British America to the East of the Rocky Mountains. As the present paper is less upon the Algonkin, Sioux and like classes than upon the distribution of languages over the different areas of North America this is as much as need be said upon the subject.

For the Northern two-thirds of the United States, *East of the Mississippi*, the same rule applies. The Sioux area begins in the West. The Algonkin class, of which the most Northern branch belongs to Labrador, where it is conterminous with the Eskimo, and which on the west contains the Blackfoot reaches as far south as South Carolina — the Nottoways being Algonkin. The enormous extent of this area has been sufficiently enlarged on. Meanwhile, like islands in an Ocean, two Iroquois district shew themselves. To the north the Iroquois, Hurons and others touch the Lakes and the Canadians frontier, entirely separated from the Tuscaroras who give a separate and isolated area in California. Whether the Iroquois area, once continuous, has been broken-up by Algonkin encroachments, or whether the Iroquois &c. have been projected into the Algonkin area from the South, or, whethen *vice versa*, the Tuscaroras are to be considered as offsets from the North is a matter for investigation. The present writer believes that south of N. L. 45. (there or there about) the Algonkins are intrusive.

N. L. 35. cuts the Cherokee, the Woccoon, the Catawba, and the Chocta area — to the west of which lies of the Mississippi.

Between the frontier of Texas, the aforesaid parallel, and the Ocean we have Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

Now here the displacement has been considerable. The part played by the Algonkins, Iroquois, and (it may be added) the Sioux

is here played by the Cherokees, the Choctahs, and the Creeks. Whatever is other than Creek, Choctah, and Cherokee is in a fragmentary form. The details of what we know through vocabularies are as follows:—

1. *The Woccon* — extinct, and allied to ——

2. *The Catawba* — also extinct. These belonged to the Carolinas. The Woccon and Catawba vocabularies are mentioned in the Mithridates.

3. *The Tinqua* — see Ludwig.

4. *The Timuacuana* — see p. 377.

5. *The Uche* — of this we find a specimen in the Archæologia Americana. The tribe belongs to the Creek confederacy and must be in a very fragmentary state.

6. *The Natchez* — on the Mississippi, facing the Caddos, Adahi.

7. *The Chetimacha.* — In Louisiana. Vocabulary in *Archæologia Americana.*

In the way of internal evidence (*i.e.* the evidence of specimens of language) this is all we have what may be called the *fragmentary* languages of the South Eastern portion of the United States. Of the Choctah, Creek, Chikkasah, and Cherokee we have an abundance, just as we have of the Algonkin and Eskimo. It is, however, the fragmentary tribes, the probable representatives of the aboriginal population, which we more especially seek.

As may be expected the fragmentary languages are (comparatively speaking) isolated. The Woccon and Catawba, indeed, are thrown into the same class in the Mithridates: but the Natchez and Uche are, by no means, closely akin. Why should they be? Such transitional forms as may once have existed have been obliterated. Nevertheless, both have miscellaneous affinities.

So much for the languages represented by specimens. In the way of external evidence I go no further than the Mithridates, and the Archæologia.

With the exception of the Woccons the Catawba and a few words from the Timuacana, the Mithridates, gives no specimens — save and except those of the Choctah, Cherokees, and Chikkasah. These two last it looks upon as the representative languages and calls them *Mobilian* from Mobile. Hence, the question which was put in Texas is, *mutatis mutandis*, put in Florida. What languages are Mobilian? What other than Mobilian?

The Woccons are either only or chiefly known through a work of Lawson's. They were conterminous with the Algonkin Pamticoughs (intrusive?), and the Cherokees.

The Catawba lay to the south of the Woccon. Their congeners are said to be

1. The Wataree;

2. The Eeno — Compare this name with the Texian Ini;
3. The Chowah, or Chowan;
4. The Congaree;
5. The Nachee — Compare with Natchez; word for word;
6. The Yamassee;
7. The Coosah — Compare (word for word) Coosada, and Coshatta.

In the South lay the Timuacana — of which a few words beyond the numerals are given.

In West Florida and Alabama, the evidence (I still follow the Mithridates) of Dr. Pratz scarcely coincides with that of the account of Alvaz Nuñez de Vaca. This runs thus.

In the island of Malhado were spoken languages of

1. The Caoques;
2. The Han.

On the coast —

3. The Choruico — Cherokee?
4. The Doguenes.
5. The Mendica.
6. The Quevenes.
7. The Mariames.
8. The Gualciones.
9. The Yguaces.
10. The Atayos — Adahi? This seems to have been a native name — "*die sich Atayos nennen.*"
11. The Acubadaos.
12. The Quitoles.
13. The Avavares — Avoyelles?
14. The Muliacone.
15. The Cutalchiche.
16. The Susola.
17. The Como.
18. The Camole.

Of migrants from the East to the West side of the Mississippi, the Mithridates gives —

1. The Pacana, conterminous with the Attacapas.
2. The Pascagula.
3. The Biluxi.
4. The Appalache.

The Taensa are stated to be a branch of the Natchez.

The Caouitas are, perhaps, word for word the Conchattas; also the Coosa, Coosada, Coshatta.

The *Stincards* are, word for word, the Tancards = *Tuncas* = *Tunicas.*

Dr. Sibley gives us *Chetimacha* as a name; along with speci-

mens of the Chetimacha, Uche, Natchez, Adahi, and Attacapa as languages.

Word for word, *Chetimacha* seems to *Checimeca; Appelusa, Apalach; Biluxi* (perhaps the same); *Pascagoula*, *Muscogulge*. How, however, did *Chichimeca* get so far westwards?

We are scarcely, in the condition to speculate much concerning details of the kind. It is sufficient to repeat the notice that the native languages of the parts in question are in a fragmentary condition; the Uche being the chief representative of them. Whether it were *Savaneric**, or not, is uncertain. It is, certainly, *not* Shawanno, or Shawno, *i. e.* Algonkin. On the contrary it is, as is to be expected, from the encroachments and displacements of its neighbourhood a very isolated language — not, however without miscellaneous affinities — *inter alia* the following.

English.....	sky.
Uche.....	*haipoung.*
Chiccasaw ...	*abbah.*
Catawba	*wahpeeh.*
English.....	day.
Uche.....	*uckkah.*
Attacapa.....	*iggl.*
Cherokee.....	*ikah.*
Muskoje	*hiyiaguy = light.*
Cherokee.....	*egah = do.*
Catawba	*heakuh = do.*
Delaware ...	*wakheu = do.*
Narrag.....	*wequai = do.*
Mapach	*do = do.*
English.....	summer.
Uche.....	*waitee.*
Adaize.....	*weetsuck.*
English	winter.
Uche.....	*wishtuh.*
Natchez	*kwishitsetakop.*
Chiccasaw ...	*hustolah.*
Seneca.....	*oushat.*
English.....	wind.
Uche.....	*ahwitauh.*
Caddo	*houeto.*
Muskoje	*hotalleye.*
English.....	rain.
Uche.....	*chaah.*
Chetimacha..	*kaya.*
Attacapa.....	*caueau.*
Caddo	*canohe.*

English	river.
Uche.....	*tauh.*
Salish	*saiulk.*
Catawba	*eesauh.*
English.....	tree.
Uche.....	*yah.*
Caddo	*yako.*
Attacape	*kagg.*
Catawba	*yup.*
Quappa	*yon.*
Esquimaux...	*keiyu = wood.*
Yancton	*cha = wood.*
Catawba.....	*yay = oak.*
English.....	leaf.
Uche.....	*yahsuh.*
Muskoghe ...	*ittohise = hair of tree = itta tree.*
Chiccasaw ...	*hoshsha.*
Choctah	*itte hishe.*
English.....	deer.
Uche.....	*wayung.*
Adahi	*wakhine.*
Cherokee.....	*ahwhih.*
English.....	bear.
Uche.....	*ptsaka.*
Natchez	*tsokohp.*
English.....	bird.
Uche.....	*psenna.*
Caddo	*bunnit.*
Tuscar.....	*tcheenuh.*
Ilinois	*pineusen.*

* More languages than one are thus named. See *p.* 375 for a Savaneric in Veragua.

Ottawa.....	*bennaisewug.*	Uche	*potshoo.*
Ojibbwa	*pinaisi.*	Caddo	*batta.*
		Minetari	*boa.*
English.....	fish.		

Such our sketch of the details. They give us more affinities than the current statements concerning the *glossarial* differences between the languages of the New World suggest. It is also be added that they scarcely confirm the equally common doctrine respecting their *grammatical* likeness. Doing this, they encourage criticism, and invite research.

There is a considerable amount of affinity: but it is often of that miscellaneous character which baffles rather than promotes classification.

There is a considerable amount of affinity; but it does not, always, shew itself on the surface. I will give an instance.

One of the first series of words to which philologues who have only vocabularies to deal with have recourse, contains the numerals; which are, in many cases, the first of words that the philological collector makes it his business to bring home with him from rude countries. So generally is this case that it may safely be said that if we are without the numerals of a language we are, in nine cases out of ten, without any sample at all of it. Their value as samples for philological purposes has been noticed in more than one paper of the present writer's here and elsewhere; their value in the way of materials for a history of Arithmetic being evident — evidently high.

But the ordinary way in which the comparisons are made between the numerals gives us, very often, little or nothing but broad differences and strong contrasts. Take for instance the following tables.

English.	Eskimo.	Aleutian.	Kamskadale.
one.....	atamek.....	attakon	kemmis.
two.....	malgok.....	alluk.....	nittanu.
three	pinajut.....	kankun	tshushquat.
four	istamat.....	thitshin	tshashcha.
five.....	tatlimat	sshang	koomdas.

No wonder that the tongues thus represented seem unlike.

But let us go farther — in the first place remembering that, in most cases, it is only as far as *five* that the ruder languages have distinct numerals; in other words that from *six* onwards they count upon the same principle as *we* do after ten, *i. e.* they join together some two, or more, of the previous numerals; even as we, by adding *seven* and *ten*, make *seven-teen*. The exact details, of course, differ; the general principle, however, is the same viz.: that after *five* the numerals become, more or less, compound, just as, with us, they become so after *ten*.

With this preliminary observation let us ask what will be the Kamskadale for *seven* when *nittanu* = *two*, and *kumdas* = *five*. The answer is either *nittanu-kumdas* or *kumdas-nittanu*. But the Kamskadale happens to have a separate word for *six*, viz. *kiekoas*. What then? The word for *seven* may be one of two things it may either = 6 + 1, or 5 + 2. The former being the case, and *kemmis* = *one*, the Kamskadale for *seven* should be either *kemmis-kilkoas* or *kilkoas-kemmis*. But it is neither one nor the other. It is *ittakh-tenu*. Now as *eight* = *tshok-tenu* we know this word to be compound. But what are its elements? We fail to find them amongst the simpler words expressive of *one*, *two*, *three*, *four*, *five*. We fail to find them amongst these if we look to the Kamskadale only — not, however, if we go farther. The Aleutian for *one* = *attak-on;* the Aleutian for *six* = *attu-on*. And what might be the Aleutian for *seven?* Even *attakh-attun*, little more than *ittakh tenu* in a broader form.

The Jukahiri gives a similar phenomenon.

Such is the notice of the care with which certain comparisons should be made before we venture to commit ourselves to negative statements.

There is an affinity amongst the American languages, and (there being this) there are also the elements of a classification. The majority, however, of the Americanlanguages must be classified according to *types* rather than *definitions*. Upon the nature of this difference, as well as upon the cause I have written more fully elsewhere. It is sufficient for present purposes to say that it applies to the languages of North Americain general, and (of these) to those of the parts beyond the Rocky Mountains more especially. Eskimo characteristics appear in the Athabaskan, Athabaskan in the Koluch forms of speech. From these the Haidah leads to the Chimmesyan (which is, nevertheless, a very outlying form of speech) and the Hailtsa, akin to the Billechula, which, itself, leads to the Atna. By slightly raising the value of the class we bring in the Kutani, the Nutkan and the Chinuk.

In the Chinuk neighbourhood we move *via* the Jakon, Kalapuya, Sahaptin, Shoshoni, and Lutuami to the languages of California and the Pueblos; and thence southwards.

In American languages simple comparison does but little. We may test this in two ways. We may place, side by side, two languages known to be undoubtedly, but also known to be not very closely, allied. Such, for instance, are the German and Greek, the Latin and Russian, the English and Lithuanic, all of which are Indo-European, and all of which, when placed in simple juxta-position, by no means show themselves in any very palpable manner as such. This may be seen from the following table, which is far from being the first which the present writer

has compiled; and that with the special view of ascertaining by induction (and not *a priori*) the value of comparisons of the kind in question.

English.	Latin.	Cayuse.	Willamet.
man	homo	yúaut	atshánggo.
woman	mulier	pintkhlkaiu	pummaike.
father	*pater*	píntet	sima.
mother	*mater*	penín	sinni.
son	filius	wái	tawakhai.
daughter	filia	wái	tshitapinna.
head	*caput*	talsh	tamutkhl.
hair	crinis	tkhlokomot	amutkhl.
ear	*auris*	taksh	pokta.
eye	*oculus*	hăkamush	kwalakkh.
nose	*nasus*	pitkhloken	unan.
mouth	os	sumkhaksh	mandi.
tongue	*lingua*	push	mamtshutkhl.
tooth	*dens*	tenif	púti.
hand	manus	epip	tlakwa.
fingers	digiti	épip	alakwa.
feet	*pedes*	tish	puüf.
blood	sanguis	tiweush	méëuu.
house	domus	nisht	hammeih (—fire).
axe	securis	yengthokinsh	khueshtan.
knife	culter	shekt	hekemistāh.
shoes	calcei	taitkhlo	ulumóf.
sky	cœlum	adjalawaia	amiank.
sun	*sol*	huewish	ampiun.
moon	*luna*	katkhltóp	utap.
star	*stella*	tkhlikhlish	atuininank.
day	*dies*	eweiu	umpium.
night	*nox*	ftalp	atitshikim.
fire	ignis	tetsh	hammḗih.
water	aqua	iskkainish	mampuka.
rain	pluvia	tishtkitkhlmiting	ukwíï.
snow	*nix*	poi	nukpeik.
earth	terra	lingsh	hunkhalop.
river	*rivus*	lushmi	mantsal.
stone	lapis	ápit	andi.
tree	arbor	lauik	huntawatkhl.
meat	caro	pithuli	umhók.
dog	canis	náapang	mantal.
beaver	castor	pieka	akaipi.
bear	ursa	limeaksh	alotufan.
bird	avis	tianiyiwa	pōkalfuna.
great	magnus	yaúmua	pul.
cold	frigidus	shunga	pángkafiti.
white	albus	tkhlaktkhláko	kommóu.
black	niger	shkupshkúpu	maieum.
red	ruber	lakaitlakaitu	tshal.
I	*ego*	ining	tshii.
thou	*tu*	niki	máha.
he	ille	nip	kak.
one	*unus*	na	wáän.

English.	Latin.	Cayuse.	Willamet.
two	*duo*	leplin	kéën.
three	*tres*	matnin	upshin.
four	*quatuor*	piping	táope.
five	*quinque*	táwit	húwan.
six	*sex*	nóiná	taf.
seven	*septem*	nóilip	pshinimua.
eight	*octo*	nōimát	kēëmúa.
nine	*novem*	tanáuiaishimshin	wanwaha.
ten	*decem*	ningitelp	tínifia.

Again — the process may be modified by taking two languages known to be *closely* allied, and asking how far a *simple* comparison of their vocabularies exhibits that alliance on the surface, *e. g.*: —

English.	Beaver Indian.	Chippewyan.
one	it la day	ittla hē.
two	onk shay day	nank hay.
three	ta day	ta he.
four	dini day	dunk he.
five	tlat zoon e de ay	sa soot la he.
six	int zud ha	l'goot ha hé.
seven	ta e wayt zay	tluz ud dunk he.
eight	etzud een tay	l'goot dung he.
nine	kala gay ne ad ay	itla ud ha.
ten	kay nay day	hona.
a man	taz eu	dinnay you.
a woman	iay quay	tzay quay.
a girl	id az oo	ed dinna gay.
a boy	taz yuz é	dinnay yoo azay.
interpreter	nao day ay	dinnay tee ghaltay.
trader	meeoo tay	ma kad ray.
moose-deer	tlay tchin tay	tunnehee hee.
rein-deer	may tzee	ed hun.
beaver	tza	tza.
dog	tlee	tlee.
rabbit	kagh	kagh.
bear	zus	zus.
wolf	tshee o nay	noo nee yay.
fox	e yay thay	nag hee dthay.

The difference is great: but the two forms of speech are mutually intelligible. On the other hand, the Cayuse and Willamet are more alike than the English and Latin.

Next to the details of our method, and the principles of our classification, the more important of the special questions command attention. Upon the relations of the Eskimo to the other languages of America I have long ago expressed my opinion. I now add the following remarks upon the prevalence of the doctrine which separated them.

Let us imagine an American or British ethnologist speculating

on the origin and unity of the European populations and arriving, in the course of his investigations, at Finmark, or any of those northern parts of Scandinavia where the Norwegian and Laplander come in immediate geographical contact. What would be first? Even this — close geographical contact accompanied by a remarkable contrast in the way of the ethnology: difference in habits, difference in aptitudes, difference in civilisation, difference of creed, difference of physical form, difference of language.

But the different manner in which the southern tribes of Lapland comport themselves in respect to their nearest neighbours, according as they lie west or east, illustrates this view. On the side of Norway few contrasts are more definite and striking than that between the nomad Lap with his reindeer, and reindeer-skin habiliments and the industrial and highly civilized Norwegian. No similarity of habits is here; no affinity of language; little or intermixture, in the way of marriage. Their physical frames are as different as their moral dispositions no and social habits. Nor is this difficult to explain. The Norwegian is not only a member of another stock, but his original home was in a southern, or comparatively southern, climate. It was Germany rather Scandinavia; for Scandinavia was, originally, exclusively Lap or Fin. But the German family encroached northwards; and by displacement after displacement obliterated those members of the Lap stock whose occupancy was Southern and Central Scandinavia, until nothing was left but its extreme northern representatives in the most northern and least favored parts of the peninsula. By these means two strongly contrasted populations were brought in close geographical contact — this being the present condition all along the South Eastern, or Norwegian, boundary of Lapland.

But it is by no means the present condition of those parts of Russian Lapland where the Lap population touches that of Finland Proper.

Here, although the Lap and Fin differ, the difference lies within a far narrower limit than that which divides the Lap from the Norwegian or the Swede. The stature of the Lap is less than that of the Fin; though the Fin is more short than tall, and the Lap is far from being so stunted as books and pictures make him. The habits, too, differ. The reindeer goes with the Lap; the cow with the Fin. Other points differ also. On the whole, however, the Fin physiognomy is Lap, and the Lap Fin; and the languages are allied.

Furthermore — the Fin graduates into the Wotiak, the Zirianean, the Permian; the Permian into the Tsheremiss, the Mordvin &c. In other words, if we follow the Lap eastwards we come into a whole fancy of congeners. On the west, however, the further we went, the less Lap was everything. Instead of being Lap it

was Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, or German. The last of those, however, would lead us into the Sarmatian family, and this would bring us round to the Fins of South Finland. The time, however, may come when Russia will have so encroached upon the Fin populations to the south of the Arctic Circle as for the Lap and Slave to come in immediate contact; and when this contact is effected there will be contrast also — contrast less strong, perhaps, than that between the Lap and Swede, but still contrast.

Mutatis mutandis — this seems to have been the case with the Eskimo and the North American Indians as they are popularly called — popularly but inaccurately; inasmuch as the present writer considers the Eskimo to be as truly American as any other occupants of the soil of America. On the East there has been encroachment, displacement, and, as an effect thereof, two strongly contrasted populations in close geographical contact — viz.: the Eskimos and the northern members of the Algonkin family. On the west, where the change has been less, the Athabaskans, the Kolutshes, and the Eskimos graduate to each other, coming under the same category, and forming part of one and the same class; that class being by no means a narrow, though not an inordinately, wide one.

Another special question is that concerning the origin of the Nahuatl, Astecs, or Mexicans. The maritime hypothesis I have abandoned. The doctrine that their civilisation was Maya I retain. I doubt, however, whether they originated anywhere. By this I mean that they are, though not quite *in situ*, nearly so. In the northermost parts of their area they may so entirely. When I refined on this — the common sense — view of them I was, like many others, misled by the peculiar phonesis. What it is may be better seen by an example than explained. Contrast the two following columns. How smoothly the words on the right run, how harshly sound (when they can be sounded) those of the left. Not, however, that they give us the actual sounds of the combination *khl* &c. All that this means is that there is some extraordinary sound to be expressed that no simple sign or no common combination will represent. In Mr. Hale's vocabularies it is represented by a single special sign.

ENGLISH.	SELISH.	CHINUK.	SHOSHONI.
man	skaltamekho	tkhlekala	taka.
woman	sumaăm	tkhlākél	kwun.
boy	skokosea	tklkaskus	natsi.
girl	shautum	tklalekh	naintsats.
child	aktult	etshanúks	wa.
father	luáus	tkhliamáma	ápui.
mother	skúis	tkhlianáa	pia.

English.	Selish.	Chinuk.	Shoshoni.
wife	makhonakh	iuakhćkal	wćpui.
son	skokosea	etsokha	natsi.
daughter	stumtshăălt	okwukha	nanai.
brother	katshki (elder)	kapkhu	tamye.
sister	tklkikee	tkhliau	namei.

Now if the Astec phonesis be more akin to the Selish and its congeners than to the Shoshoni and other interjacent forms of speech, we get an element of affinity which connects the more distant whilst it separates the nearer languages. Overvalue this, and you may be misled.

Now, not to mention the fact of this phonesis being an overvalued character, there is clear proof in the recent additions to the comparative philology of California that its distribution is, by no means, what it was, originally, supposed to be. This may be seen from the following lists.

From the North of California.

(1.)

English.	Wish-osk.	Wiyot.
boy	ligeritl	kushama.
married	wehowut'l	haqueh.
head	wutwetl	metwet.
hair	pah'tl	paht'l.
face	kahtsouetl	sulatek.
beard	tseh'pl	cheh'pl.
body	tah	hit'l.
foot	wehlihl	wellih'tl.
village	mohl	katswah'tl.
chief	kowquéh'tl	kaiowuh.
axe	mahtl	mehtl.
pipe	maht'letl	mahtlel.
wind	rahtegut'l	ruktagun.
duck	hahalitl	hahahlih.

(2.)

English.	Hupah.	Tahlewah.
neck	hosewatl	
village		wah'tlki.
chief		howinnequutl.
bow		chetlta.
axe	mehlcohlewatl	

In the South of California.

English.	Duguno.	Cuchan.
leg	cwith'l	misith'l.
to-day	enyat'l	
to-morrow	matinyat'l	

English.	Dugund.	Cuchan.
bread	meyut'l	.....
ear.....	hamat'l	smyth'l.
neck	.....	n'yeth'l.
arm .....(	selh	iseth'l.
hand .....)		
friend	.....	nyet'l.
feather.....	.....	sahwith'l.

I cannot conclude without an expression of regret that the great work of Adelung is still only in the condition of a second, or (at best) but a third edition. There is Vater's Supplement, and Jülg's Supplement to Vater. But there is nothing that brings it up to the present time.

Much might be done by Buschmann and perhaps others. But this is not enough. It requires translation. The few French writers who treat on Ethnological Philology know nothing about it. The Italians and Spanish are, *a fortiori*, in outer darkness as to its contents. The Russians and Scandinavians know all about it — but the Russians and Scandinavians are not the scholars in whose hands the first hand information falls first. The Americans know it but imperfectly. If Turner has has had easy access to it, Gallatin had not: whilst Hales, with great powers, has been (with the exception of his discovery of the Athabaskan affinities of the Umkwa and Tlatskanai, out of which Turner's fixation of the Apatch, Navaho, and Jecorilla, and, afterwards, my own of the Hoopah, seems to have been developed,) little more than a collector — a preeminent great collector — of raw materials. Nevertheless, the Atna class is his.

However, the Mithridates, for America at least, wants translation as well as revision. It is a work in which many weak points may be (and have been) discovered. Klaproth, himself a man who (though he has saved many an enquirer much trouble) has but few friends, has virulently attacked it. Its higher classifications are, undoubtedly, but low. Nevertheless, it is not only a great work, but the basis of all others. Should any one doubt its acumen let him read the part which, treating on the Chikkasah, demurrs to the identification of the Natchez with that and other forms of speech. Since it was written a specimen of the Natchez language has shewn its validity.

I think that the Natchez has yet to take its full importance. If the language of the *Tuensas* it was, probably, the chief language of *Tennessee*. But the Creek, or Muscogulge, broke it up. Meanwhile the fragmentary Catawba, with which I believe that the Caddo was connected had its congeners far to westward.

I also think that the Uche represents the old language of Florida — the Cherokee being conterminous with the Catawba.

If so, the doctrine of the fundamental affinity between the Pawni, Caddo, Catawba, and Cherokee gains ground.

The Uche demands special investigation. The Tinquin and Timuacana should be compared with it. Then why are they not? Few works are more inaccessible than a Spanish *Arte*, *Diccionario*, or *Catecismo*. The *data* for these enquiries, little known, are still less attainable. Without these, and without a minute study, of the first-hand authorities we can do but little but suggest. All that is suggested here is that the details of Florida (in its widest sense) and Louisiana must be treated under the doctrine that the aborigines are represented by the congeners of the Woccon, Catawba, Uche, Natchez, Tinquin, and Timuacana, inordinately displaced by the Cherokees and Creeks; who (for a great extent of their present area) must be considered as intrusive.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CONTENTS.

I. Pædeutica — Page.

Inaugural Lecture 1

On the study of Medicine 15

On the study of Language 27

II. Logica

On the word *Distributed* 39

III. Grammatica

On the reciprocal Pronouns, and the reflective Verb . . . 45

On the connexion between the Ideas of Association and Plurality as an influence in the Evolution of Inflection . . 57

On the word *cujum* 60

On the Aorists in KA 64

IV. Metrica

On the Doctrine of the Cæsura in the Greek senarius . . 68

On the use of the signs of Accent and Quantity as guides to the pronunciation of words derived from the classical Languages 74

V. Chronologica

On the Meaning of the word ΣΑΡΟΣ 81

VI. Bibliographica

Notice of works on the Provincialisms of Holland 85

VII. Geographica

On the Existence of a nation bearing the name of *Seres* . 89

On the evidence of a connection between the Cimbri and the Chersonesus Cimbrica 93

On the original extent of the Slavonic area 108

On the terms *Gothi* and *Getae* 129

On the Japodes and Gepidae 131

VIII. Ethnologica

On the subjectivity of certain classes in Ethnology . . . 138

General principles of philological classification and the value of groups, with particular reference to the Languages of the Indo-European Class. 143

Traces of a bilingual town in England 152

On the Ethnological position of certain tribes on the Garrow hills 153

Page.

On the transition between the Tibetan and Indian Families in respect to conformation 154
On the Affinities of the Languages of Caucasus with the monosyllabic Languages 156
On the Tushi Language 168
On the Name and Nation of the Dacian king Decebalus, with notices of the Agathyrsi and Alani 175
On the Language of Lancashire under the Romans . . . 180
On the Negrito Languages 191
On the general affinities of the Languages of the oceanic Blacks 216
Remarks on the Vocabularies of the Voyage of the Rattlesnake 223
On a Zaza Vocabulary 242
On the Personal Pronouns and Numerals of the Mallicollo and Erromango Languages, by the Rev. C. Abraham . . 245
On the Languages of the Oregon Territory 249
On the Ethnography of Russian America 266
Miscellaneous contributions to the Ethnography of North America 275
On a short Vocabulary of the Loucheux Language, by J. A. Isbister 299
On the Languages of New California 300
On certain Additions to the ethnographical philology of Central America, with remarks on the so-called Astek Conquest of Mexico 317
Note upon a paper of the Hon. Captain Fitzroy on the Isthmus of Panama 323
On the Languages of Northern, Western and Central America 326

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY,
BERKELEY

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW

Books not returned on time are subject to a fine of 50c per volume after the third day overdue, increasing to $1.00 per volume after the sixth day. Books not in demand may be renewed if application is made before expiration of loan period.

MAR 5 19[illegible]

JUL 30 1968

MAY 27'69 -11 AM
LOAN DEPT.

DEC 17 19[illegible]

200m'50LR

4Z Jan 54 WB

JUL 10 1970 42

FEB 3 1954 LU

240ct61DF

REC'D LD JAN 14 71 -5 PM 33

RET'D TO ART-
ANTHRO LIBRARY

JAN 7 1962

DEAD

JAN 4 - 1967 7

REC'D LD APR 23 '68 -5 PM

20m-11,'20

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C046967700

104620